

D 509

.S5

Copy 1

America and the War in Europe A Symposium

THE WOMEN OF LIEGE

BY EVA KATHERINE GIBSON

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE WAR

BY A. MAURICE LOW, M. A.

Washington Correspondent of the London Morning Post
Author of "The American People, a Study in National Psychology"

GERMANY INTERPRETED BY A
GERMAN-AMERICAN

BY "AN AMERICAN CITIZEN of German Parentage"

THE VICE REGENT OF GOD AND
HIS CHOSEN PEOPLE

BY WILLIAM H. SKAGGS

WITH RED EYES

A CHANT OF HATE AGAINST ENGLAND

BY ERNST LISSAUER

THE DAY

BY HENRY CHAPPELL

Compiled by William H. Skaggs

Price: Twenty-five cents

Return to
Div. of Bibliography
Lib. of Congress
(Not yet Catalogued)

GREAT BRITAIN AND THE WAR

SOME PRESS COMMENTS

"There can be no doubt as to Mr. Low's being the finest, clearest, most unanswerable statement of England's case as yet presented. It is a noble utterance which covers every point in the most dignified language, and it is difficult to conceive how anything stronger and truer can ever be written.

"The British may well rest their case on Mr. Low's admirably expressed appeal to the fairness and intelligence of the civilized world."

—Philadelphia Public Ledger.

"The best because the most compact and lucid statement of the English case that has yet appeared is the reply of A. Maurice Low, the Washington correspondent of the London Morning Post, to the German statement put forth by Ambassador Count von Bernstorff.

"Mr. Low puts it unanswerably as follows * * *

—Louisville Courier-Journal.

"On this page is printed a remarkable article by Mr. A. Maurice Low, Washington correspondent of The London Morning Post, and a writer of distinction and ability. Mr. Low makes a thorough study of the German contentions and both his argument and his conclusions are intensely interesting and instructive. The contentions upon which Count von Bernstorff, German Ambassador to the United States, bases his entire case are examined in detail and proved to be absolutely fallacious and untenable, in the light of the official correspondence and the facts.

"Mr. Low not only justifies Great Britain's participation in the war as an obligation of honor which could not be avoided but he finds that the entire responsibility for the war rests with Germany, and that any peace is impossible until the main issue is decided and German militarism definitely destroyed beyond all hope of resurrection.

"The article is certainly one of the best of its kind that has been written, and should be read by all those who desire a concise and authoritative statement of the points at issue and an examination of the German defence. It is the first duty of patriotism to be informed on the present war, so far as essentials and principles are concerned, and Canadians generally will be well advised to read Mr. Low's discussion."

—The Toronto Daily News.

"The publishers have thought it desirable to include in this volume for the purpose of giving to the presentation of the case against Germany a full measure of completeness, a statement from the well known writer Mr. A. Maurice Low, who discusses without heat, but with the authority of a scholarly publicist, the evidence and the documents on the causation of the war, and the relative responsibilities of England and Germany."

—Publisher's Note to "The Real Truth About Germany."

Injustice, swift, erect, and unconfined,
Sweeps the wide earth, and tramples o'er mankind,
While Prayers, to heal her wrongs, move slow behind.
Homer-Pope's Trans.

America

and the

War in Europe

A Symposium

War is one of the greatest plagues that can afflict humanity; it destroys religion; it destroys States; it destroys families. Any scourge is, in fact, preferable to it. Famine and pestilence become as nothing in comparison with it.
—Luther.

If Europe should ever be ruined, it will be by its warriors.
—Montesquieu.

To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.
—George Washington.

1509
S. 5

By transfer
The White House.



EVA KATHERINE GIBSON

The Women of Liege

By Eva Katherine Gibson.

The rose of dawn flashed red
On the grey old Flemish towers
When they heard the thundering tread
Of the haughty foe's powers;
Then the bugles rang out clear,
Sang shrill through the startled village.
"To arms! The foe is here!
And their hosts breathe war and pillage.
Lo, they march through our harvest fields
To crush fair France, our neighbor;
To arms! brave Belgian lads, bring gun and saber."
Oh the hurrying to and fro
In the quaint old houses:
Oh the thrill in the gallant hearts
'Neath the rough blue blouses.
Oh the kisses and swift farewells
With tears choked back: "No sighing,
Now we fight," said the women of Liege,
"There'll be time at eve for crying."
In the grey old factories' walls
They banded, these wives and mothers,
To fight for their native land
By the side of their gallant brothers:
"For life without honor is base,"
Said the loyal women of Flanders.
So they welcomed the foe with flame
Till the arrogant grim commanders
Swore with deep throated oaths:
"By heaven, they make this a siege!
They are wildcats, these women of Liege!"
"Lest the rifle, the bayonet blade,
These weapons our own hands made
Be turned 'gainst our own loved land
Let us make 'tho we die, here our stand.
Courage my sisters! now aim."
And the startled soldiers fled;
As the cold blue steel flashed red,
Love and Peace are the rule
That women should follow, clearly,
But peace at the price of right
May be bought too dearly,
For Love without Valor is naught
But a selfish clinging

To hold back the spirit of man
 From its brave up-springing;
 And the courage that dies for Truth,
 In a cause so splendid,
 Will make its full worth felt
 'Ere the struggle is ended.
 You may crush with your trampling hordes,
 All the flowers in the blood-stained grasses
 But the souls of those Women of Liege
 Will defy your close packed masses.
 And the heroes such mothers bear,
 'Tho they die they will never falter
 'Till the light of a new day dawn
 Upon Freedom's altars.
 While the whole earth trembles and shakes
 With the sound of your guns grim roaring,
 There's a mightier power than yours
 O'er the smoke of your battles soaring:
 'Tis the spirit of man made free,
 And it counsels wiser
 Than the roar of your big Krupp guns,
 Or the mandate of King or Kaiser.

"A land without ruins is a land without memories—a land without memories is a land without history. A land that wears a laurel crown may be fair to see; but twine a few sad cypress leaves around the brow of any land, and be that land barren, beautiful and bleak, it becomes lovely in its consecrated coronet of sorrow, and it wins the sympathy of the heart of history. Crowns of roses fade—crowns of thorns endure. Calvaries and crucifixions take deepest hold of humanity—the triumphs of might are transient—they pass and are forgotten—the sufferings of right are graven deepest on the chronicle of nations."

The political history of Germany, from the accession of Frederick in 1740 to the present hour, has admittedly no meaning unless it be regarded as a movement towards the establishment of a world empire, with the war against England as the necessary preliminary.

—Professor Cramb.

Germany is fighting to establish the validity and permanence of Machtpolitik—the doctrine that might makes right. * * *

If the Germans succeed in establishing the doctrine of Macht-

politik in Europe, they frankly say that they will endeavor to extend its sway throughout the world. German domination in Europe, however noble the ambitions and visions of some of its advocates, would eventually mean forcible conflict with the theories of government which at present prevail in the United States, Argentina, Brazil and Chile, the four great republics of the Western world.

—The Outlook.

He is a fool, and that nation is a fool, who, having the power to strike his enemy unawares, does not strike and strike his deadliest.

—Frederick the Great.

The state's highest moral duty is to increase its power.

The state is justified in making conquests whenever its own advantage seems to require additional territory.

In fact, the state is a law unto itself. Weak nations have not the same right to live as powerful and vigorous nations.

—Gen. von Bernhardt.

The average German, whom the foreigner sees, is aggressive, self-assertive, loud in his manner and talk, inconsiderate, petty, pompous, dictatorial, without humor; in a word, bumptious. He has, in many cases exceedingly bad table manners and an almost gross enjoyment of his food; and he talks about his ailments and his underwear. His attitude toward women, moreover, is likely to be over-gallant if he knows them a little and not too well, and discourteous or even insolent if he is married to them or does not know them at all.

—"A German-American" in The Outlook.

Gentlemen, we are now in a state of necessity, and necessity knows no law. Our troops have occupied Luxemburg, and perhaps are already on Belgian soil. That, gentlemen, is contrary to the dictates of international law. * * * France could wait, but we could not wait. A French movement upon our flank upon the lower Rhine might have been disastrous. So we were compelled to override the justified protests of the Luxemburg and Belgian government. The wrong—I speak openly—that we are committing we will endeavor to make good as soon as our military goal has been reached.

—The Imperial Chancellor, von Bethmann-Hollweg, to the German Reichstag on August 4.

Only one is master of this country. That is I. Who opposes me, I shall crush to pieces. . . . Sic volo, sic jubeo. We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone, and to God alone we are responsible in the fulfillment of duty. . . . Suprema lex regis voluntas.

Thanks to the valor of my heroes, France has been severely pun-

ished. Belgium, which interfered with our attack, has been added to the glorious provinces of Germany.

—Kaiser William.

Necessity is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves.

If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country I never would lay down my arms, never! never! never!

The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail, its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter,—but the king of England can not enter; all his forces dare not cross the threshold of the ruined tenement.

—William Pitt (*Earl of Chatham*).

It is only the vulgar minds that mistake bigness for greatness; for greatness is of the soul, not of the body. In the judgment which history will hereafter pass upon the forty centuries of recorded progress towards civilization that now lie behind us, what are the tests it will apply to determine the true greatness of a people? Not population, not territory, not wealth, not military power; rather will history ask what examples of lofty character and unselfish devotion to honor and duty has a people given? What has it done to increase the volume of knowledge? What thoughts and what ideals of permanent value and unexhausted fertility has it bequeathed to mankind? What works has it produced in poetry, music, and other arts to be an unfailing source of enjoyment to posterity? The small peoples need not fear the application of such tests.

The world advances, not, as the Bernhardi school supposes, only or even mainly by fighting; it advances mainly by thinking and by the process of reciprocal teaching and learning; by the continuous and unconscious co-operation of all its strongest and finest minds.

—James Bryce (*Viscount Bryce*).

We shall not sheathe the sword, which we have not lightly drawn, until Belgium has recovered more than she has sacrificed; until France is adequately secured against menace; until the rights of the smaller nationalities have been placed upon an unassailable foundation, and until the military domination of Prussia is finally destroyed.

—Prime Minister Asquith.

If, beginning with the eleventh century, we examine what has happened in France from one half century to another, we shall not fail to perceive, at the end of each of these periods, that a twofold revolution has taken place in the state of society. The noble has gone down on the social ladder, and the commoner has gone up; the one descends

as the other rises. Every half century brings them nearer to each other, and they will soon meet.

The principle of the sovereignty of the people, which is always to be found, more or less, at the bottom of almost all human institutions, generally remains there concealed from view.

In America, the principle of the sovereignty of the people is not either barren or concealed, as it is with some nations; it is recognized by the customs and proclaimed by the laws; it spreads freely, and arrives without impediment at its most remote consequences.

—De Tocqueville.

The influence over government must be shared by all the people. If every individual which composes their mass participates of the ultimate authority the government will be safe.

In a government bottomed on the will of all, the life and liberty of every individual citizen becomes interesting to all.

—Thomas Jefferson.

It is the eternal struggles between these two principles—right and wrong—throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time; and will ever continue to struggle. The one is the common right of humanity and the other the divine right of kings. It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself.

—Abraham Lincoln.

When once Belgium was invaded, every circumstance of national honor and interest forced England to act precisely as she did act. She could not have held up her head among nations had she acted otherwise. In particular, she is entitled to the praise of all true lovers of peace, for it is only by actions such as she took that neutrality treaties, and treaties guaranteeing the rights of small powers will ever be given any value. * * *

Germany's attack on Belgium was not due to any sudden impulse. It had been carefully planned for a score of years, on the assumption that the treaty of neutrality was, as Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg observed, nothing but "paper", and that the question of breaking or keeping it was to be considered solely from the standpoint of Germany's interest. The German railways up to the Belgian border are for the most part military roads, which have been double-tracked with a view to precisely the overwhelming attack that has just been delivered into and through Belgium.

—Theodore Roosevelt.

War's Only Excuse

(From the "Cours de Morales," a French school book.)

No! I cannot consent to be a murderer or to die myself save for a good that is higher than life, save for a duty that is more imperious than the essential duty of respecting the lives of others. Now, there is one thing of supreme value, one thing that is the very foundation of my moral duties, the very reason for civilization; it is the right of being a free man; it is the right of guarding intact my dignity as a citizen; it is the right to go and come as I please in my own country, to pay no tax save that of my own levying, to speak my own language freely, to be subject to the law of no despot, man, or nation of prey.

A Contrast

The Emperor William at Berlin, March 29, 1901:

"We will be everywhere victorious even if we are surrounded by enemies on all sides and even if we have to fight superior numbers, for our most powerful ally is God, who, since the time of the Great Elector and Great King, has always been on our side."

Abraham Lincoln, during the darkest hours of the Civil War, in response to the question whether he was sure that God was on "our side":

"I do not know; I have not thought about that. But I am very anxious to know whether we are on God's side."—The Outlook.

Great Britain and the War*

(Reprinted by permission of Mr. Low.)

By A. Maurice Low.

In a recent interview given by Count von Bernstorff, the German Ambassador, he based his defense of Germany's position upon these assertions:

1. That Russia provoked the war.
2. That had Russia not been certain of the support of Great Britain she would not have made war upon Austria.
3. That, Austria having been forced into war, Germany was compelled by her treaty engagements to come to the support of her ally.
4. That England, because of her jealousy and enmity of Germany, encouraged both Russia and France to make war on Austria and Germany, although England had no cause to be jealous of Germany.

Having thus proved to his own satisfaction that Germany is the helpless victim of British duplicity and Russian brutality and French malignity, Count Bernstorff wonders why the preponderating sympathy of America is with England and her Allies and against Germany and Austria.

Documents Tell the Story

I shall not attempt to answer the first assertion, because it is unnecessary. Every one who has read the British and German official diplomatic correspondence knows the truth. To that correspondence Count Bernstorff can add nothing and from it I can subtract nothing. That correspondence requires neither explanation nor elucidation. It shows precisely what the British government did in its attempts to prevent war; it shows what Count Bernstorff's sovereign failed to do to curb his ally. If that correspondence does not convince the reader certainly nothing that Count Bernstorff can say will alter his opinion; nothing that I might write will influence any person's calm judgment. Those telegrams that passed between ministers and ambassadors in the fateful days of July are now history, and to the judgment of history they may be safely left.

Count Bernstorff asserts that if Russia had not been certain of the support of England she would not have forced war upon Austria. The *tu quoque* is the weakest form of argument. Nevertheless I feel justified in asking if Austria had not felt absolutely certain of the support of Germany would she have challenged Russia? The answer is obvious. Single handed Austria is no match for Russia. Count Bern-

*Reprinted, in response to many requests, from the New York *Herald*, of September 21, 1914.

The discussion of the so-called German "peace proposals" has since been added.

storff knows that; the professional advisers of the Austrian Emperor knew it. The military resources of Russia are so incomparably superior to those of Austria that only a desperate gambler, willing to put his crown on the table as the stakes, would have risked the throw of the cards. And Austria did not have a free hand. She was hampered on her flank by Servia, a little nation, but so powerful that Austria's ill-starred campaign against her has collapsed. Austria could not disguise the menace of Bosnia and Herzegovina. She had violated the treaty of Berlin when she absorbed them into her empire in pursuance of her "civilizing mission," and their people looked for the day when they might throw off the Austrian yoke.

But I do not rely on assertion. For ten days prior to July 31 Sir Edward Grey, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, had labored day and night to prevent war. On that day he sent a telegram to Sir Edward Goschen, the British ambassador in Berlin, expressing the hope that the conversations then proceeding between Austria and Russia would lead to a satisfactory result. The stumbling block hitherto, he explained, had been Austrian mistrust of Servian assurances and Russian mistrust of Austrian intentions with regard to the independence and integrity of Servia. In order to overcome these suspicions Sir Edward Grey suggested Germany might sound Vienna and he would agree to sound St. Petersburg whether it would be possible for the four disinterested powers—Germany, Italy, France and Great Britain—to offer to Austria that she should obtain full satisfaction of her demands on Servia, provided they did not impair Servian sovereignty and Servian integrity, Austria already having declared her willingness to respect them; and Russia would be informed that the four disinterested powers would undertake to prevent Austrian demands going the length of impairing Servian sovereignty and integrity, and he added:

"I said to the German ambassador this morning that if Germany could get any reasonable proposal put forward which made it clear that Germany and Austria were striving to preserve European peace, and that Russia and France would be unreasonable if they rejected it, I would support it at St. Petersburg and Paris, and go the length of saying that if Russia and France would not accept it His Majesty's government would have nothing more to do with the consequences; but otherwise I told the German ambassador that if France became involved we should be drawn in."

In the light of the above can any honest man say that Russia felt certain of the support of Great Britain? As a matter of fact, neither Russia nor France was sure of what Great Britain would do, and her course was to be governed solely by whether they were "reasonable." What Sir Edward Grey wanted above and beyond everything else

was to preserve the peace of Europe, and to accomplish that, to save the world from the horrors it is now experiencing, he was willing to throw the great influence of England on the side of Germany and Austria if they were sincerely working for peace and to leave France and Russia to their fate if they were unreasonable and determined to provoke war.

Further confirmation, if any is needed, that neither France nor Russia knew what England would do and that she did not declare her position until circumstances forced her to take up arms is to be found. On that same day, July 31, the French Ambassador in London was trying to induce British support of France in case she was attacked by Germany and was urging Sir Edward Grey to promise to come to the assistance of France. But Sir Edward Grey would make no promise. There were circumstances, he explained, that might prevent England from remaining neutral and force her into war as the ally of France, but he could enter into no engagement. On August 1 the British ambassador in Vienna telegraphed to Sir Edward Grey, "There is great anxiety to know what England will do." Austrian anxiety was shared by Russia. Thus as late as the first of August neither of Britain's subsequent Allies, Russia and France, nor one of her soon to be foes, Austria, knew what England would do.

And yet Count Bernstorff says the war would not have happened had not Russia been certain of the support of England.

What about Germany? Did she feel certain what England would do? The correspondence is of peculiar interest as tending to controvert the German Ambassador's assertion that Germany was dragged into war. From the beginning of the critical relations between Austria and Russia, owing to the despatch of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, Sir Edward Grey had regarded the matter as a quarrel between Austria and Serbia in which the other European Powers were not concerned. He knew, of course, of the Austro-German alliance, as he knew of the Franco-Russian alliance, but he saw no reason why those alliances should be invoked. Germany and France he considered "disinterested" Powers and placed them in the same category as Italy, also the ally of Germany and Austria, and England, neither the ally of Russia or France, but who might be compelled to support France and Russia under certain circumstances. If Russia and Austria must fight, Sir Edward Grey held, it was bad enough, but that was better than to see the whole of Europe at war. Germany was not bound to come to the support of Austria unless she was determined to force France into the war; France need not go to the assistance of Russia unless she was looking for a *casus belli* against Germany.

France had joined with England in using her influence with Rus-

sia to keep the peace. France had given no provocation to Germany. On July 29 Sir Edward Goschen telegraphed to Sir Edward Grey he had been invited that evening to call upon the Chancellor, who said that if Austria was attacked by Russia Germany would be compelled to come to her assistance. Provided that the neutrality of Great Britain were certain, every assurance would be given to the British government that Germany aimed at no territorial acquisition at the expense of France. Sir Edward Goschen asked what about the French colonies, but the Chancellor said that he "was unable to give a similar undertaking in that respect."

As for Belgium—whose neutrality it will be remembered Germany had guaranteed—"it depended upon the action of France what operations Germany might be forced to enter upon in Belgium, but when the war was over Belgium integrity would be respected if she had not sided against Germany." As a further bid for English neutrality the Chancellor added, with almost childlike simplicity, as if vague promises in the future counted for anything in an emergency so great, "he had in mind a general neutrality agreement between England and Germany, though, of course, it was at the present moment too early to discuss details, and an assurance of British neutrality in the conflict which the present crisis might produce would enable him to look forward to the realization of his desire."

And Count von Bernstorff would ask the American people to believe that Germany was trying to avoid war with France.

Sir Edward Grey's reply was spirited and to the point. There is nothing finer in the entire correspondence. It exhibits the Secretary of State indignant at the offer of a bribe, but still trying to preserve peace and showing Germany how that could be done.

Sir Edward telegraphed the next day to the British Ambassador:—

"His Majesty's government cannot for a moment entertain the Chancellor's proposal that they should bind themselves to neutrality on such terms.

"What he asks us is in effect to engage to stand by while French colonies are taken and France is beaten, so long as Germany does not take French territory as distinct from the colonies.

"From a material point of view such a proposal is unacceptable, for France, without further territory in Europe being taken from her, could be so crushed as to lose her position as a great Power and become subordinate to German policy.

"Altogether apart from that, it would be a disgrace for us to make this bargain with Germany at the expense of France, a disgrace from which the good name of this country would never recover.

"The Chancellor also in effect asks us to bargain away whatever

obligation of interest we have as regards the neutrality of Belgium. We could not entertain that bargain, either."

Having rejected the bribe offered by Germany, having with dignity and restraint repudiated the suggestion that Great Britain could remain passive while France was being crushed to satisfy the overweening ambition of Germany, Sir Edward Grey still showed that the one thing of all others he desired was peace, and he pointed out the way by which that object might be attained. He instructed his Ambassador to say to the Chancellor:

"One way of maintaining good relations between England and Germany is that they should continue to work together to preserve the peace of Europe. If we succeed in this object the mutual relations of Germany and England will, I believe, be, *ipse facto*, improved and strengthened. For that object His Majesty's government will work in that way with all sincerity and good will."

Is this the language or the act of a man trying to entice Russia into making war on Germany?

Sir Edward Grey was to give still further proof of his sincerity and his almost fanatical attachment to the cause of peace. In that same despatch to Sir Edward Goschen he continued:—

"And I will say this:—If the peace of Europe can be preserved and the present crisis safely passed my own endeavor will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia and ourselves, jointly or separately."

Could anything be more straightforward, more binding, than this voluntary pledge? For years Germany has told the world that she was not seeking war, that her enormous army and her powerful navy, rapidly rivaling that of Great Britain, were safeguards of peace and to prevent France and Russia from attacking her. Sir Edward Grey bound himself to bring about an arrangement by which Germany would be assured she need have no fear of the hostility of France, Russia or Great Britain. Had Germany been sincere in her protestations that she was ready to defend herself, but reluctant to provoke her neighbors, she would eagerly have accepted Sir Edward Grey's offer, but, as Sir Edward Goschen reported, the Chancellor received the communication "without comment."

And Count von Bernstorff imposes upon American intelligence by trying to have it believed that Great Britain was persuading Russia to go to war.

Germany Began the War.

Count von Bernstorff asserts that Germany did not begin the war. It is not material who strikes the first blow when two men are deter-

mined to quarrel, but for the vindication of history the facts should not be garbled. On August 2, before Russia, France or Great Britain had committed a single act of hostility against Germany, she violated the neutrality of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg. On the preceding day Sir Edward Grey had telegraphed Sir Edward Goschen that the authorities at Hamburg had forcibly detained British merchant ships, and he requested that the German government send immediate orders for the release of the vessels, as the effect on public opinion would be deplorable unless that was done. The British government, he added, was most anxious to avoid any incident of an aggressive nature, and he hoped the German government would be equally careful not to take any step which would make the situation impossible. These vessels were released the next day after their cargoes had been forcibly seized, an act that Sir Edward Grey protested against.

On August 3 the German government sent an ultimatum to Belgium demanding free passage for her troops and threatening to use force if the request was refused. Sir Edward Grey protested against Germany violating Belgian neutrality, which Germany, in common with England, had guaranteed. On August 4 the German government informed the Belgian government that it would enter Belgium, "in view of the French menaces." For the first time Germany used the fear of France as a pretext for war. Hitherto she had pretended Russia was a menace; now she suddenly discovered it was France that threatened. On that same day Sir Edward Grey telegraphed to Sir Edward Goschen that he continued to receive numerous complaints from British firms of the detention of their ships at Hamburg, Cuxhaven and other German ports. This action, Sir Edward declared, was totally unjustifiable and in direct contravention of international law and of the assurances given by the Imperial Chancellor.

Thus Germany had thrice offended against the law of nations and the moral law. She had violated the neutrality of Luxemburg, whose neutrality she had guaranteed. She had violated the neutrality of Belgium, whose neutrality she had agreed to respect. She had seized British vessels and their cargoes while Great Britain and Germany were still at peace.

Count von Bernstorff, speaking as German Ambassador to the United States, asserts that Germany did not strike the first blow.

Having thus exposed a few of the errors into which the German Ambassador has been unconsciously betrayed in dealing with the political phases of this wanton war, attention may be usefully called to some of His Excellency's lapses when he discusses the psychology of American public sentiment. He mournfully recognizes the fact that

American sentiment is hostile to Germany and explains it by saying that almost immediately after the declaration of hostilities England cut the German transatlantic cable, so that the United States should be misinformed as to the truth and only news passing through London and Paris could reach America.

This is childish. The cable was cut as a military measure, as Count von Bernstorff very well knows, and for no other reason. The American people have the news and the truth; they get the news in their newspapers and the truth they can find by reading the German and British White Papers, which have been published in this country. They have heard the truth about the destruction of Louvain, the slaughter of women and children in Antwerp, the scattering of mines in the North Sea and the tribute exacted from Brussels and Liege in defiance of the humane spirit of the age. The German Ambassador ought not to regret that the cutting of the cable has made it difficult for news to reach America; rather he ought to pray that other cables may be quickly cut, so that no further knowledge of German atrocities can reach the United States.

Count von Bernstorff professes not to be able to understand English enmity and cannot find any justification for it, although he acknowledges England has long been jealous of Germany's increasing prosperity and her growing navy. It is curious what tricks memory plays. For years Germany—not her people or individuals, but her officials and governing classes—has shown its dislike of England and offensively rattled the sabre in the sound of English ears. There was the Kaiser's telegram to Kruger, for instance; the obscene insults to the late Queen during the Boer war; the Kaiser's sneers and slurs at King Edward; the crisis precipitated over Agadir and the revenge he took in making France dismiss Delcassé.

It was these things and hundreds of others that made it so difficult for the well wishers and friends of Germany in England—and I have no apology to make for counting myself as one of them—to use their influence, much or little as the case might be, to bring about better relations with Germany. There is no military party in England. England, with the sole exception of the United States, is the one great Power that is not subordinate to the military. No Englishman wanted to go to war with Germany. No Englishman could see that there was anything to be gained by war with Germany. Time after time Germany gave us provocation and we kept our temper. Those of us who believe that war is usually a crime, the most insensate act nations can commit, believed that the German Emperor was too sensible of his obligations to his people and posterity, too wise not to recognize the desperate risk he took in plunging Europe into war when the honor of his country was not impugned nor national safety endangered.

The fact is the Kaiser held all too lightly the military power of Great Britain. He is an autocrat, a militarist, and therefore he cannot understand the aspirations and the motives of a democracy. That a country so powerful as Great Britain, with a world-flung Empire, should content itself with a standing army insignificant compared with the millions Germany is able to call to the colors; that it should rely for its defense on volunteers instead of resorting to conscription; that the civil and not the military power should be supreme—these things to the Kaiser were incongruous and were to be explained only on the theory that England was a decaying nation, that the England of the Napoleonic wars had lost its virility, that, engrossed in money making and trade, it had become steeped in luxury and enjoyment and was either too cowardly or too indifferent to fight. And accepting that as a premise, it is easy to see how he reached his conclusion—England would not fight; England was not to be feared.

Part of the Kaiser's reasoning was correct. England does not want to fight, but the mistake the Kaiser made was in believing that England would not fight. She will fight, as the Kaiser has learned to his cost, when honor is at stake, and when not to fight would be, as Sir Edward Grey said, "a disgrace from which the good name of this country would never recover." She might have escaped war had she been content to see Belgium outraged and the plighted fate of nations mocked and the covenants between peoples broken by dismissing a treaty as "only a scrap of paper"; she could have imitated the example of Italy and found a pretext for deserting her allies; she might have bought immunity by accepting the insincere promises of Germany and claiming she had given greater assistance to France through her diplomacy than she could render by force of arms. These things England might have done. These things England would have done if the Kaiser's estimate of the English character had not been founded on false premises. But these things England did not do. Forced to fight, she has fought, because there are times when a nation, similar to an individual who loves peace and abhors a brawl, must either defend himself or in shame no longer dare claim kinship of his fellows.

It does not become the German Ambassador to accuse England of being jealous of Germany's prosperity. While Germany has built a wall of tariffs against England, England has thrown the doors to her market places wide open. She has shown no hostility to the legend "Made in Germany." A commercial nation—and commerce is England's strength—does not go to war to overthrow competition, because no one knows better than the banker and the merchant and the trader that war does not pay. Germany found in the United Kingdom and the British dominions and dependencies her richest and most profit-

able market, and through her own folly Germany has lost a trade she can never recover.

In two weeks after the declaration of war the German merchant marine, the pride of the Kaiser's heart, had virtually disappeared from the seven seas. German merchant vessels, from the magnificent *Imperator* and *Vaterland* down to the disreputable looking tramps, all the shipping that so proudly flew the German flag on the Atlantic and the Pacific, on the main travelled routes as well as in remote places where a cargo is to be picked up or goods made in Germany can find a purchaser, is either interned in neutral ports or tied up in German harbors or condemned as lawful prize by the British courts.

The German navy, which was the challenge of Germany to Britain on the seas, the greatest provocation one nation ever gave to another, which the German Emperor fondly imagined would make him as supreme on the sea as he imagined he was invincible on land, has been compelled to seek the security of its fortified bases. While British ships go about their ordinary business, while the great transatlantic lines under the British flag are running on their regular schedules, while cargoes of foodstuffs and other commodities are flowing in a never ending stream from American ports eastward and the current runs undisturbed in the reverse direction and British goods find their accustomed markets, Germany is beginning to feel the pinch of hunger, German industries are prostrate, German commerce is paralyzed.

It is these things that make Germany so bitter against England. They explain why Count von Bernstorff seeks to throw the responsibility upon England and hopes to gain American sympathy. He frankly admits that he is amazed by "the general hostility of the American press." The American press—and I think I speak with exact knowledge—has not been hostile, but it has been just. It has not been partisan, but it has pronounced judgment. On the evidence submitted it has rendered decision. Before the great bar of conscience the Kaiser has been brought to his assize. History has rendered its verdict. Without cause he provoked a war; to gratify ambition he sowed desolation. Little children he has made fatherless, and brides to mourn their husbands. The tears of the living and the blood of the dying drench Europe. His legions have marched, and with them have gone ruin, death, horror. He has spared neither young nor old. He has spread the torch and with flame and sword devastated city and plain. He has made the world a house of mourning; he has stricken down the firstborn and brought sorrow to the aged. He has made honor a jest and the word of a King a thing of scorn. He has invoked the name of God and defiled man made in the image of his Maker. Under his iron heel he has crushed civilization and checked its progress.

Knowing the truth, it would be amazing if the American press and the American people were able to withhold their sympathy from the nations forced by Germany to defend themselves.

Does Germany Want Peace?

Since the above was written there have been numerous articles in the newspapers intimating that Germany was willing to make peace, and the German Ambassador has endeavored to make the American people believe that while Germany is ready to end the war, Great Britain and her Allies prefer to fight rather than to restore peace to the world and end its toll of blood and misery.

On September 6 Mr. Oscar S. Straus, a member of the Hague Permanent Tribunal of Arbitration, came to Washington and told Secretary Bryan he believed that the German Emperor would be willing to consider terms of peace. Mr. Straus had met Count Bernstorff at a dinner in New York, and had been given to understand by him that Germany would be glad to have the United States exercise its good offices to bring hostilities to an end. Mr. Straus asked the consent of the German Ambassador to repeat the conversation to Mr. Bryan, and was permitted to do so.

Mr. Straus saw Mr. Bryan and was authorized by him to call on the British and French Ambassadors and ascertain from them the views of their Governments. Both Ambassadors informed Mr. Straus that they had received no instructions on the subject, but they would communicate any proposal made to them. For the benefit of the reader unfamiliar with the forms of diplomacy, it should be explained that an Ambassador cannot bind his Government without specific instructions, and can only act in accordance with the instructions he has received from his Foreign Minister. The British and French Ambassadors informed Mr. Straus that their Governments desired peace, as they always had, but it must be no temporary truce; it must be peace made under such conditions that it would be a lasting peace, and Great Britain, France and Russia could feel certain they would not again be suddenly attacked.

Mr. Bryan had in the meantime asked Count Bernstorff to come to Washington so that he could ascertain whether he had been authorized by the German Emperor to seek the good offices of the United States. Count Bernstorff admitted he had received no instructions. His conversation with Mr. Straus was based on his own belief that the German Emperor was not adverse to peace. Mr. Bryan asked Count Bernstorff if he had any objection to Mr. Gerard, the American Ambassador to Germany, ascertaining whether the German Government would accept an offer of mediation made through the United States. To this Count Bernstorff assented.

The British and French Ambassadors at once communicated the sub-

stance of Mr. Straus' conversation to their respective Governments. Sir Edward Grey, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, speaking for England as well as her Allies, confirmed in effect what Sir Cecil Spring Rice, the British Ambassador, had informally said to Mr. Straus. It was that Great Britain desired peace, but it must be a lasting peace. If Germany had terms to offer that would effectually insure peace the Allied Powers would receive and consider them.

Germany having taken the first steps it was incumbent upon her, if she was sincere and acting in good faith, to make known the terms she proposed. If she was not sincere, if Count Bernstorff, with or without instructions, was simply "fishing," hoping to learn that the Allies were discouraged and disheartened and would welcome peace at any price, the purpose would have been served and the United States would be told that Germany had no terms to offer.

The reader will be able to form his own conclusions as to Count Bernstorff's sincerity and the good faith of Germany.

Mr. Gerard in due course saw the German Imperial Chancellor, who had the effrontery—not to use a harsher word—to say that "the United States ought to get proposals of peace from the Allies." When Mr. Gerard's report was made to the President, Mr. Wilson saw that it was useless to press the matter further.

If Germany had been sincere, if in good faith she had wanted peace, the Chancellor would not have banged the door in the face of the United States.

It is only necessary to say a few words regarding the present position of Great Britain and her Allies. England desires peace, sincerely and ardently she longs for peace, but it must be no sham peace, no mockery of the word.

If ever a nation fought the battle of the world, fought for liberty and in the cause of righteousness, that nation is England. She is today doing what she did a hundred years ago when she rid the world of the menace of a military despot and saved Europe from coming under the dominion of one man. She stands today the bulwark against militarism and a military oligarchy. She stands today for liberty, freedom of thought and action; the subordination of the sword to the rule of law. She stands today the champion of Democracy, the right of man to be "sole sponsor of himself." If she is crippled or crushed, the dam that holds back militarism is swept away. For many years Europe has been an armed camp. Should England cease to be a Great Power all Europe will be divided into two parts—Germany and the rest, military satrapies governed by an autocrat in Berlin, arrogating to himself the divine right to govern.

There will no longer be any "little nations," Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway will be robbed of their nationality

and independence, their national aspirations, their manner and customs, their ideals, their memories of the past, their hopes of the future. They will be ground under the iron heel of Germany, conquered provinces, their people valuable only as increasing the power of German military autocracy, an autocracy that will not be satisfied with having enslaved Europe but will seek the conquest of other worlds so that Democracy may perish from the face of the earth and absolutism be the creed of kings.

This war is not of England's seeking. She has been forced into it, and having been forced into it she will not relinquish the sword until it can be sheathed with safety. Resolutely, with grim determination the British Empire is determined there shall be an end of militarism. Too long has the world lain under the grievous curse of its armed hosts. Too long has the terror of war threatened. Too long has the corruption of the sword worked.

England has not gone into this war with a light heart. There are today no light hearts in England, in Scotland, in Ireland, in any place where the British flag flies. But whatever the cost, whatever the sacrifice, we must see this thing through, we must save civilization from a return to barbarism, from the shame of reverting to the day when justice was unknown and only strength was feared.

Were England to make peace now, to make peace on such terms as the German Emperor would only too willingly accept, she would be forever disgraced and deserve the contempt of all mankind. England has taken upon herself a very solemn duty—the preservation of the national existence of Belgium against the rapacity of Germany. The most virulent enemy of England, of France, or Russia has for Belgium only admiration; profound admiration for her courage, profound pity for the ruin and desolation that have moved the compassion of the world.

Accident involved Belgium. She was the ally of none of the combatants. She was not concerned in the jealousies or intrigues of the Powers. She had no revenge to satisfy; no long standing debt of hate to settle. She offered no provocation. She was peacefully pursuing her own affairs, her people happy and prosperous, their safety assured. For had not Germany, France and England entered into a treaty to respect the neutrality of Belgium?

The German Emperor had pledged his Kingly word, and he broke it with never a thought of shame. The quickest way to strike at the heart of France was through Belgium; Belgium must either allow her territory to be violated or she would be crushed. When England remonstrated, when England protested against the infraction of the treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium, England was told that a treaty was merely a scrap of paper. So lightly did the German Emperor hold his honor.

Gallant little Belgium! To her honor was more than a scrap of paper. To her duty was more than the hypocrisy of a phrase. Confronted with the choice between safety bought at a price that only cowards would pay or freedom purchased at a price that might make the bravest hesitate, she did not flinch. She would fight. She might be conquered, but she would not be a craven.

Belgium must be protected; her safety must be assured; she must be compensated for the wrongs she has suffered; her cities must be rebuilt; her starving and ruined people must be helped. Only in one way can this be done—Germany must be deprived of her power again to outrage Belgium; for all the destruction that Germany has done, Germany must be made to pay. It would be a farce to rely on German “assurances,” to place any faith in a treaty. Germany has shown she has no respect for treaties. She laughs at a scrap of paper. All that she respects is force; to her force is more to be respected than honor. To make peace now would be to hand over Belgium, racked and tortured, to the executioner. It would be disgraceful. It would be a greater infamy than Germany’s infamous crime.

The present generation is thrilled when it reads of battles and great deeds, the warm blood of youth is chilled when, with the ready response of youth, it reads of the dead and dying, the horrors of the battlefield, but youth cannot grasp what it means to a nation to be at war. It is the men of a former generation who understand. They know. They recall those four long, agonizing years, years that tried men’s souls, that brought out all that was best and bravest in a people, when women with breaking hearts smiled through their tears and companioned by death lost not their courage, when men met disaster bravely and defeat made them only the more resolute.

They were fighting for a great cause, and it sustained them. The same spirit animates England today.

I desire to correct the statement that has so often been made in the German press and by Germans in high official position that England wants to destroy Germany. Nothing could be farther from our thoughts. We have no grudge against Germany; we English have no dislike of the Germans. What we want to destroy is German militarism. That is the only destruction we are determined to accomplish.

Consider for a moment. Does any sensible man ruthlessly destroy his own property? Is it not only a fool who ruins his best customer? Would it not be the act of a madman to make himself poorer? This is the price England will pay were she so foolish to “destroy” Germany. Englishmen have millions of pounds invested in German enterprises, and German destruction means the loss of those investments. Germany was England’s best customer, as England was Ger-

many's best customer, and is it to be supposed that England would deliberately destroy her best market? Cannot everyone see that the greater the prosperity of Germany, the more Germany buys from England, the more England will sell to Germany? Every ship Germany has put on the ocean; every yard of goods Germany has sold in South America, in India, in Africa, in England; every machine she has built, every pound of dyestuffs, every barrel of cement she has made; everything that has kept her factories and her people profitably employed has been an extension of the world's commerce, has added to the wealth of the world, has made it possible for more people to buy the things that England manufactures, has made England richer.

What can England make out of this war? Nothing, absolutely nothing. England's land hunger has long been satisfied, she has cast no covetous eyes on German colonies. Were Germany to pay an indemnity so huge that it would virtually reduce her to slavery, the millions would not compensate England for all that the war will cost her, for the loss of life, for the misery of women, for the tears of the fatherless, for the dislocation of commerce, for the impoverishment of the whole world. And when the world is poor England, because of her industrial and financial position, is the chief sufferer.

The German people do not believe that England seeks their destruction, but German militarism must justify itself. Callous as the ruling class of Germany has always been to the opinion of the world, in this emergency, knowing it stands condemned, it craves the support of the United States, and in defense attributes to England base motives.

We have put on our armor. We shall carry it through the heat of the day. Its burden is heavy, but we shall not take it off until men again breathe free, no longer affrighted by the terror of war.

When that day comes we shall make peace.

(Reprinted by permission of The Outlook.)

Germany Interpreted by a German American

The following article comes to us from the pen of an American citizen of German parentage. An alumnus of a well-known Eastern preparatory school and a distinguished graduate of Harvard University, the writer is as truly American in his sympathy and understanding as any editor of The Outlook. He is a man of large imagination and spiritual comprehension. His interpretation of the attitude of the rest of Europe toward Germany is one, we think, which will interest our readers as much as it has interested the staff of The Outlook. This partially humorous yet wholly serious article will explain to our readers many of the causes for the acknowledged unpopularity of Germany among its neighbor nations. His explanation is illuminating, the more so since it comes from one who is German by descent and German in his sympathies. Nevertheless, The Outlook still maintains that fire and steel are not the means wherewith to make old foes into new friends.—THE EDITORS.

There are causes and causes behind the great war that is going on in Europe at this moment, and the catch-phrases the diplomatists toss hither and back—Slavic peril, Teuton arrogance, English greed—do not tell the whole story. Nor is it entirely safe to raise one's hand in holy horror to the awful effects of monarchism and to blame unreservedly the Kaiser for the cataclysm. There are causes less obvious, but no less real and scarcely less important.

One of these is the German's resentment against the unfriendly attitude his fellow-Europeans have held toward him for decades; an attitude originating in a feeling of social superiority and exhibiting itself in suspicion and mistrust. This attitude is prevalent in Europe. I am informed that it is not unknown in Asia. I know by personal experience that even here in America—years ago, perhaps, more than to-day—it has in its lighter phases been widespread. I myself was brought up in this country; and I shall not forget the scorn that was visited upon me because I was a "Dutchman" by blood. Like the Teuton that I was, I took those attacks very seriously and tried to explain, quite without comprehension of the comic values of the situation, that I was German and not Dutch. That made matters rather worse. I had friends of my own nationality, and I heard them scoffingly referred to as *Dutchmen*. I heard the butcher and grocer also called *Dutchmen* in a tone of voice meant to reproach. We were all lumped together, fair game for all. I tried to forget all I knew of the German language, because it seemed to me to have some sort of shame connected with it; and only the heroic endeavors of my father and mother balked me in this. As I grew older and less obviously German in manner and mode of thought, I heard less

of the taunt *Dutchman*, but became aware with a shock that a great many estimable people considered the German, on the whole, inferior socially to the Anglo-Saxon or Latin of the same group. It puzzled me, for instance, that a very noble-spirited friend of mine, an American of German parentage like myself, should have been shown the door by the father of his lady-love for no reason other than that he was a German. The father confessed to having a violent antipathy to Germans. It puzzled me also that friends of my own, New Englanders of great charm and culture, should speak to Germans in general with a sweeping contempt that was almost disgust. I went abroad. The French, I found, detested the Germans of course—remembering Sedan and a few other things, perhaps they had good reason; but the Italians disliked them also. The Germans had a way, it seemed, of invading a perfectly good landscape and spoiling it to the Italian eye. I met a physician and his wife who looked, acted, and spoke English like Germans, and I took it for granted that they were. But I was told indignantly that they were nothing of the kind. They were Dutch; and I was swiftly made aware of the fact that I had been disagreeable. I made the same mistake with an Austrian, and the Austrian, too, set me straight without mincing words. In Europe, as in America, I found that the people of other nations do not consider it quite good form to be a German. You may be an Italian or a Portuguese with impunity, but there is something a little off color in being a German. I resented this, and I believe that others of German blood have resented it before and since.

There are, of course, potent though superficial reasons for this general dislike of the German. The average German, whom the foreigner sees, is aggressive, self-assertive, loud in his manner and talk, inconsiderate, petty, pompous, dictatorial, without humor; in a word, bumptious. He has, in many cases exceedingly bad table manners and an almost gross enjoyment of his food; and he talks about his ailments and his underwear. His attitude toward women, moreover, is likely to be over-gallant if he knows them a little and not too well, and discourteous or even insolent if he is married to them or does not know them at all. He is at his worst at the time when he is most on exhibition, when he is on his travels or helping other people to travel, as ticket-chopper or custom official. The average European, other than German, coming in contact, sometimes rather violently, with the German I have described, jumps to the conclusion that the bumptiousness and the occasional coarseness are the whole man, when they are actually only the veneer. Your scoffer, be he French, English, Italian, or American, does not as a rule, have time to discover the calm-headedness behind the quick-tempered exterior, the incorruptible integrity, the loyalty to family, to a cause, or to an ideal, the tender-heartedness, the fine sentiment, the artistic sensibility. The foreigner

sees the bad manners, and declares that the German is a boor and not to be reckoned among gentlemen.

The German has felt, not the contempt perhaps, but the suspiciousness, engendered by the misunderstanding. He has felt quite rightly that he has no friends beyond his borders. He has secured his place in the sun for himself, he has traded with the ends of the earth; but he has made no friends. He does not understand why this should be so; he himself is unconscious of the superficial faults which seem to be so annoying to others. He certainly does not realize that foreigners raise their eyebrows at the way he devours his meals. All that he knows is that he has no friends over the border, that his every move is watched with envy and mistrust, and that there is no one to take his part. The German has ever been honest and industrious, seeking to make his way by peaceful means; and he has been galled beyond endurance by an opposition which he did not guess was based largely on a flippant contempt for his table manners.

This conviction of his isolation among the peoples of Europe, gained from travel or business association, achieves in the eyes of the German possibly greater significance than it deserves because it appears as a corroboration of what he has learned at school. It is a frequently repeated fact that Germany is geographically so situated that she must look constantly to her own protection. She must have an army. To have an army she must stir up patriotism in the people. And so the German is taught (much as the American boy is taught that the British were all very, very bad in the Revolution and the Americans were all very, very noble and good) that the Russian is a wolf on the east and the Frenchman a fox on the west; and God knows the bugbear "perfidious Albion" is made out to be! From his earliest childhood the German is thus taught that he is surrounded by enemies. I remember once arguing at a dinner-table on the bank of the Rhine that there really did not seem to be great usefulness in keeping alive the old anger against the French. "Oh!" cried a dear lady of sixty-odd, flushed with indignation; "but the French are our natural enemies!"

This war, then, is, I believe, not the cold piece of diplomatic jobbery on the part of the Kaiser and his advisers that the American papers assert it to be. The discrimination, therefore, between the German Government and the German people which the New York "Evening Post," for instance, has made in an editorial entirely sympathetic with the aims and ideals of the latter does not seem to me quite valid. The Kaiser, moreover, is not quite as mediaeval as he sounds. During the succession of war scares which the past decade has produced he has had the opportunity of finding out whether or not his people stood behind him. I was in Germany during the crisis in August, 1911. My brothers and cousins who

were in the German army and navy had their marching orders in their pockets. None of them wanted to go to war, but all felt that war was inevitable sooner or later. A civilian with whom I discussed the situation, a man who happened to be a member of the Prussian Landtag, was bitter against the Kaiser, not at all because he thought the Kaiser was rushing into war, but, on the contrary, because he seemed to the speaker to be ruining Germany's prestige right and left by swallowing insult after insult from France and England. I found this point of view supported on many sides. The feeling against France and England was so intense that I felt it must be absurdly, blindly unjust. I went to England shortly after, with my sympathies, on the whole, inclining toward the English side. Three little incidents in quick succession showed me that the feeling of the Germans that England was bitterly hostile to them was not without foundation. In a street in Kensington I heard one laborer who was passing say bitterly to another: "I hope we go an' wring the bloom-in' livers out o' the damned Dutchman!" A few days later a German merchant who had lived and worked in London for forty years took me through his club in the city. "We Germans are not very popular in this club," he said. "If things get any worse between the nations, I shall have to resign. The English resent the acceleration of business methods which Germans have made necessary by their competition. The English like to do business leisurely. But the efficiency of the German traders the world over has forced them to realize that they must either bestir themselves mightily or drop hopelessly behind." This attitude is not inconsistent with what other nations have discovered concerning the English. They are, on the whole, not very good sportsmen.

The third incident happened at a dinner party at Queen's Gate. I had happened to mention that I thought it too bad that the Germans allowed themselves to work up such a war scare about England. In his reply my host did not let the fact that I was German by blood interfere in the least with the expression of his views. With flushed face and bitter words, he blamed all his troubles and all the troubles of England on Germany, and especially on Germany's navy. He could not see at all that Germany had a right to build ships for her own protection and for the protection of her growing colonies. His bitterness was that of the man who sees himself being beaten in a fair game and is losing his nerve.

Politically, Germany was isolated by Edward VII, but socially the German people have always been isolated. And the *furor teutonicus*, to which Dr. Ernst Richard refers in a recent number of *The Outlook*, is aflame in them now, rightly or wrongly, because they feel that they are fighting men who wish them ill, and fighting for their existence. "Though devils should rise against us on all sides," cried the Imperial Chancellor in a recent speech, "still we should fight to the end!" That is the feeling:

of the German: "There are devils on all sides. Sooner or later they must be downed. To-day is as good as to-morrow. Rather better, in fact. So to-day be it!"

The *Dutchman's* back is against the wall, just as it used to be in my boyhood days in Brooklyn years ago in snow-time when the taunting Anglo-Saxons were after him.

The Vice Regent of God and His Chosen People

By William H. Skaggs.

"One American's Strong Opinion.

Address delivered in the Press Club by William H. Skaggs."

(Amplified and reprinted in response to requests.)

William H. Skaggs, who addressed us last Wednesday, and whose rather forcible speech is reported verbatim in these pages, was the first native born American to appear in the course of war talks now going on. Whether he voiced the sentiment prevailing among Americans or merely his own is not for the Club to say. But it can say Mr. Skaggs knew his own mind and delivered it with engaging frankness.

He was born in Talladega, Alabama, and has given much of his time to newspaper and magazine work. He is a lecturer of high repute, and an earnest politician.—The Scoop.

A cataclysm has come in the history of civilization and the extended sweep of this violent disturbance has shaken the foundations of Christendom. We can not be indifferent to the consequences of this disaster, nor should we fail to heed the warning of a life and death struggle between absolutism and democracy. I believe I am free of race prejudice, so far as any phase of the present conflict is concerned, but my bringing up and environments have made me intensely American. This war involves fundamental issues vital to the American people, and we shall not be able to escape its influence on our national life. It is a crisis that calls for intense feeling, not only in our sympathy for the peoples involved, but also in our deep concern for what may happen to us.

The present world-wide war has unfolded a state of public opinion which can not be ignored. Enlightened public opinion in this country, when associated with virile appreciation of democratic principles, is in sympathy with the Allies. We have no prejudice against the German people, who are far advanced in education, industrial development and commercial expansion; but their present civilization is essentially material and, from our point of view, it is lacking in that ethical culture which develops a proper appreciation of the higher ideals of American institutions.

We have in this country good people from every civilized race and nation of the world. Our country has been a cave of Adullam for the poor and oppressed of all races. Among other good citizens of foreign birth, we have many able, worthy and useful men and women from Germany. We have no prejudice against these citizens of German lineage, but we can not be good Americans and remain silent in the face of this appalling crisis. The neutrality of this nation need not suppress the noblest impulses of its citizens. Our president has wisely and properly

proclaimed the neutrality of this nation, and in this policy he has the support of the people; he has, also, with equal discretion and propriety, received a commission from one of the belligerents.

Immediately following presentation of the Belgian Commission at the White House, Mr. Brand, of Chicago, publisher of the *Staats-Zeitung*, appeared in Washington for the purpose of presenting to the president a petition signed by German-American citizens of Wisconsin, Illinois and Indiana. The president decided not to receive Mr. Brand, his delegation and petition. The president was right, and all good Americans, regardless of party affiliation, will sustain him. At the beginning of this war, President Wilson expressed his opinion of hyphenated Americans, and he has been sincere and delicately diplomatic in his neutrality. President Wilson was a historian before he was a publicist, and his scholarly attainments have fitted him for a very responsible position in the present international crisis. One need not be a constituent of the president in order to give him full credit for his wise and patriotic policy under a delicate situation in our foreign relations.

"This war is no accident, but an inevitable result of long incubation; inevitable as the cataclysms that sweep away the monstrous births of primeval nature." It is a mighty convulsion in political and social science, a struggle between medievalism and modern civilization; in the end, civilization, with its modern concept of higher social and political ideals, will triumph. This is not a race war. An attempt to becloud the issue by alleging probable danger of the "Slavic Peril" in Europe and the "Yellow Peril" in this country has misled nobody of ordinary intelligence.

German deeds belie German words. Moreover, there have been so many conflicting and contradictory statements from high authorities, the world has no confidence in any statements made by the German government touching its purposes and policies. At the beginning of this war, the Imperial German Chancellor stated that their troops had advanced into Belgian territory and "the injustice that we thereby committed we shall rectify as soon as our military object is achieved." The German Emperor now declares that, "Belgium, which interfered with our attack, has been added to the glorious provinces of Germany." The Machiavellian policies of Bismarck are well represented by the Imperial Chancellor; the brigandage of Frederick the Great has again added to the "glorious provinces of Germany." The vandalism of Attila and the craftiness of Metternich continue to shape the destinies of the German peoples.

All of this talk about the so-called "Slavic Peril" presumes upon the ignorance of those to whom the plea is made; it is the same old German subterfuge. "It is easy for princes, under various specious pretenses, to defend, disguise and conceal their ambitious desires."

Every branch of the Slavic race is well represented in this country and, in the present crisis, they have demeaned themselves peaceably, with a quiet dignity and unselfish patriotism which has won the respect of the American people. Those who could return to their fatherland have gone back to fight for it; those who could not return have remained here and gone about their business, doing what they could to help the needy and unfortunate in their native country. Unlike the German-Americans, they have not found it necessary to make public demonstrations, or to annoy their neighbors with a spectacular display of hyphenated patriotism and vulgar bombast.

In the early history of our struggles for national existence, the capture of Burgoyne at Saratoga was one of the most important victories won by the American revolutionists, and it was the strategic work of a Polish patriot. The fortifications at West Point were constructed under the direction of this Polish patriot and our colonial fathers were not much perturbed about the "Slavic Peril" when this Polish officer of "courage, modesty and sound judgment" was made adjutant to General Washington. We are told by Bancroft, "among his latest official acts, Washington interceded with congress on behalf of Kosciusko, pleading for him 'his merit and services from the concurrent testimony of all who knew him'; and congress accordingly granted to the Polish exile, who was to become dear to many nations, the brevet commission of brigadier-general."

The Servians, or Serbs, and all European branches of the Slavic race, have been intensely patriotic and made their place in the history of civilization by defending their homes and their government. For many generations, they have stood on the eastern frontiers of Europe, defending western civilization against the inroads of the Turks. While the petty states of Germany held their subjects in serfdom, engaged in barbaric and fratricidal strife among themselves, pliant tools of the Holy Roman Empire, the Slavic races of the Balkan States were bravely serving on the outposts of civilization. Sobieski, Kosciusko, and Kossuth have brighter and more memorable places in history than Bahrdt, Metternich and Nietzsche. Tolstoy was worth more to civilization and the cause of humanity than Bernhardi, and he will be remembered long after Bernhardi has been forgotten.

The racial history of the Slavic races in the Balkan States can be traced for fifteen hundred years. These people established great empires. In the language of Prof. Hart, "The first people who wrote about the Germans found them anything but unified. Their chief pursuits seemed to be drinking mead and fighting their neighbors; or, if there were no neighbors handy, fighting each other. The first unifying principle came from without." The first "conception of one

king for the Germans, who should at the same time be Emperor of the world," came with Charlemagne, the great king of the Franks. German history began about the year 840, when the vast empire of Charles the Great was divided into three parts.

The Slavic races are not barbarians, although they are first cousins to the Germans, who have Tartar blood in their veins. The Huns were Tartars, and after they overran central Europe, little is heard of them after the death of Attila. They were defeated by the Franks on the border-land of the Germans and then "assimilated themselves to the populations of their environments." They were absorbed by the Germans, hence the evidence of the Tartar spirit in the philosophy of the German rationalist and militarist and the policies of German rulers. This tainted blood of the German rulers has been observed not only in the Hohenzollern dynasty but also in other ruling families of the German states who have intermarried with reigning families of other nations. German kings of England, the Hanover dynasty, prior to the reign of Victoria, were reactionary and corrupt. Catherine the Great, Empress of Russia, was a German and a very remarkable woman, one of the greatest rulers of modern times and one of the most immoral and infamous. She was a friend of Voltaire and cultivated French thinkers. The physical and moral degeneracy of German rulers has brought untold trouble and suffering on Europe. The present German Emperor talks like a madman. Bismarck taught him to hate England and everything English, including his mother. He is the most arrogant, blatant and vicious sovereign the world has known for many years. Of very ordinary attainments, if he were not ruler of a great empire, he would be regarded as a very bumptious, commonplace charlatan.

It was the Slavic stock that saved Germany from Ottoman conquest and it is the Slavic stock which has now joined with England to save Belgium and France from German conquest. When the Turks conquered Hungary and besieged Vienna they were finally repulsed by the Slavic race. "It was the Serb Bakich who saved Vienna, says a Hungarian historian." Sobieski, John III, with 20,000 Polish troops, saved Vienna and prevented the Ottomans from ravaging central Europe. The Turkish forces were overwhelmingly defeated and driven back. Sobieski was the hero of Christendom and he was one of the greatest warriors and statesmen of his age. He was received by acclaim by the Viennese, but Emperor Leopold showed strange ingratitude in his treatment of the deliverer and of the Polish army. Ingratitude has been one of the prominent features of the Hapsburg family record. It is one of the ironies of history that the Turks, who were driven back from central Europe by the Slavic

racess, should now be the protegee and ally of the Austrians and Germans who were saved from the Turks by the Slavs. Servia is fighting for national existence and Turkey has joined with Austria and Germany to destroy the people who saved Europe three hundred years ago.

Race prejudice is neither provincial nor modern, but it is supposed to soften as civilization advances. It is true that race prejudice and religious persecution grow less obstinate as we advance in humane or spiritual development. These racial and religious prejudices are more easily aroused when nations are at war and society is disturbed by the most brutal passions of man. For the purpose of hiding their own sins and exposing the more highly civilized peoples to every possible danger, the Germans have tried to frighten Europe with the cry of "Slavic Peril" and to alarm this country with the cry of "Yellow Peril." The habit of calling the Slavic races "Asiatic barbarians" has a sinister purpose. The Slavs are a European race and have for centuries been fighting the Tartars with whom Germany has made an offensive alliance. If we may judge a nation by words and deeds of their rulers, civilization and human freedom are in more danger from the German peril than the "Yellow Peril."

From the address of Prof. Cho-Yo, before the Press Club, I quote the following: "What is the meaning of civilization, the word so much used from time immemorial. According to the most ancient thinkers, men of wisdom put the moral or ethical or humanitarian principle as the strongest and fundamental basis of governing a community and the people to be governed. China has been rich in writings, books, poems and art during 4,500 years. Far backward in point of the warfare weapons—not in the science of war." Again, from this learned Japanese I quote the following significant statement: "The violation of the Belgian neutrality perfectly justifies what Japan has been considering that Germany would be the first to try to disintegrate China.

The ultimatum sent to Germany in regard to Kiauchao was in wording, except the proper names, exactly the same as Germany sent to Japan after the Chinese-Japanese war. The treaty of peace then signed was a great international joke."

Authentic history of Japan begins A. D. 552, when the Buddhist missionaries arrived from Korea, who brought with them "letters, writing, calendars and methods of keeping time." At this period of the world's history the Germanic tribes were assimilating the Huns and ravaging Rome. German history did not begin until more than three hundred years after Buddhist missionaries were welcomed in Japan "with their letters and writings." Two hundred years before Charles the Great undertook to unify the Germans, Kotoku was Emperor of Japan

and "he was of gentle disposition; loved men of learning; made no distinction of noble and mean, and continually dispensed beneficent edicts."

By way of comparison, consider these evidences of German culture as expressed by Bernhardi:

"The state is justified in making conquests whenever its own advantage seems to require additional territory."

"In fact, the state is a law unto itself. Weak nations have not the same right to live as powerful and vigorous nations."

It is of little moment whether we judge Germany by her history or by her words and deeds of the present generation; the sum and substance of it all is the argument Thrasymachus, the Sophist, in Plato's Republic, that justice is nothing more than the advantage of the stronger, in other words, that might is right. If we compare Japan's record in the war with Russia, with Germany's record in the present war, we shall readily see how vastly superior the Japanese are in all that distinguishes a highly civilized people from an uncivilized people.

The power of absolutism in Germany has been very frankly stated by Prince Bulow, late Chancellor of the German Empire: "I must lay down most emphatically that the prerogative of the Emperor's personal initiative must not be curtailed, and will not be curtailed by any Chancellor." Or, again, danger of the Tartar Peril may be found in the declaration of the German Kaiser: "Only one is master of this country. That is I. Who opposes me, I shall crush to pieces. . . . Sic volo, sic jubeo. . . . We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone, and to God alone we are responsible in the fulfilment of duty. *Suprema lex regis voluntas.*"

The military object of Germany's invasion of Belgium has been "achieved" and Germany's national obligation has been thrown away as "a scrap of paper." Belgium has preserved her honor and safeguarded her long established character for courage and patriotism. Germany has temporarily triumphed and the brave Belgians have paid the penalty of their unfortunate position beside an assassin, but there will come a day of reckoning when this cruel war is over. Belgium will live again, honored and respected, the world will ask when shall such heroes live again, and the name of Belgium will be the synonym of truth and virtue and honor in all parts of the world. History will measure the responsibility for all the suffering, and sorrow, and humiliation of Belgium and on the escutcheon of Germany there will be a bar sinister which neither the Krupp guns nor the materialism of Nietzsche will be able to efface. The indefensible attack on Servia has added to the infamous record of the Hapsburgs, the cowardly and inhuman invasion of Belgium has added to the infamous record of the Hohenzollerns and the world is restless awaiting the destruction of these monstrous dynasties.

The invasion of Belgium, we are told, was a military necessity, for no

cause except expediency of war, and since Belgium has been occupied the world is given to understand that it will be a part of German territory, if Germany be able to hold it. Indeed, the Kaiser now advises his "dear, faithful soldiers" that "Belgium has been added to the glorious provinces of Germany." The elder Pitt said, "necessity was the argument of tyrants, it was the creed of slaves."

The inhumanity and aggressiveness of Germany's militarism is equaled only by the insolence and stupidity of her diplomacy. At the close of the war between China and Japan, Germany interfered with Japan in the most brutal manner, sending to Japan the most insolent message that one sovereign nation ever sent to another. A German officer who accompanied the Japanese army, by special courtesy of Japan, secretly reported to his government the movements of the Japanese army. This incident illustrates the extent of German espionage and the standard of German honor.

German nationalism is new and unification is not well suited to the customs and ideals of people who have so recently emerged from tribal communities in a state of serfdom. At the close of the Napoleonic period, there were 39 governmental units, including four independent city states. A German National Parliament was held in 1848 for the purpose of forming a general German constitution, but the undertaking miscarried. About the same time, a Pan-Slavic Congress was held at Prague for the purpose of bringing together the various Slav elements in the Austrian Empire in opposition to the Germans.

No progress was made in the direction of German unification until after the defeat of the Austrians at Solferino. Austrian prestige with Prussia vanished at Solferino and King William inaugurated the first constructive movement for the unification of Germany when, by disregarding, for the time being, the Hohenzollern doctrine of divine right, he called Bismarck to his support. Bismarck's masterful mind fathomed the situation and his constructive ability and iron will moulded Germany into a union which was greatly strengthened by the short war with Austria, in 1866, when Prussia, with superior arms and the superior strategy of General von Moltke, not only defeated Austria, but also whipped Saxony, Hanover, Bavaria, Wurtemberg and Hesse into line and made them a part of the new North German Confederation. This new confederation was formed in 1867 and a constitution, modeled somewhat after the U. S. constitution, was made. Universal suffrage was established after the elective system of the United States. The present constitution was made in 1871. It is a written instrument and the empire created by this constitution consists of four kingdoms, six grand duchies, five duchies, seven principalities, three free cities and one territory; all under the presidency of the King of Prussia, who bears the title of German Emperor. It is not a union of equals; certain members enjoy specific privileges which do not

belong to others. Prussia has the hereditary right to the presidency of the union, and her representation in the Federal Council is large enough to prevent changes in the constitution without her consent and she has the casting vote in case of a tie.

German unification was not complete until after the war with France. Realizing the weakness of Napoleon III, Bismarck grasped the moment of opportunity for a more perfect unification and greater expansion of the new German confederation. The suggestion of a Hohenzollern prince for the Spanish throne irritated France and Bismarck found the psychological moment for his intrigue and cunning. He falsified a report of the alleged insult by the French Ambassador and war was declared with France, the remaining German states were forced into the war, Alsace and Lorraine were annexed, and the unification was completed when King William of Prussia was declared German Emperor in the great hall of the palace at Versailles. The Holy Roman Empire was never so powerful as the German Empire. The work was well done. It was the work of a master mind, such as Germany had not produced before and has not produced since; it was the work of a blood and iron policy, a magnificent but brutal beginning of militarism, absolutism and conquest, the termination of which, in the present struggle of democracy and humanity against despotism and materialism, has appalled the civilized world.

The internal struggles of Germany began shortly after unification, but the agricultural class, the old Germany, the polite and respectable Germany, was soon smothered by the industrialism, materialism, militarism and coarseness of Prussia. Germany was swallowed up by Prussia, whose king became the German Emperor and whose votes amount to a veto on all measures which the military class and the Prussian dynasty do not approve.

German efficiency has been shown in her military organization and administration, in municipal administration and sanitary regulation. Police powers of a state can always be administered more efficiently under military direction. For safe-guarding the health of a community, in times of epidemics, and maintaining order in times of lawless disturbances, we sometimes find it necessary to support the police regulations with the military. The established militarism of Germany affords these permanent advantages in municipal regulations, hence Germany has clean, healthful and well ordered cities.

Industrialism has made wonderful progress in Germany during the present generation, so have materialism and militarism; education has made wonderful progress, illiteracy has been reduced to the minimum, but absolutism has made greater progress and idealism and all things spiritual have been reduced to a minimum. The higher and better impulses of the human heart have been subordinated to things practical and materialism has eaten the heart out of Germany. To modern Germany idealism or

humanity is a stumbling block; personal liberty or democracy is foolishness. Conquest and commerce are greater than love and honor. They occupy a low plane in civilization and their horizon is limited. If they would profit by the lessons of history, they should recall that Carthage was the greatest city of antiquity and the Phenicians had the most extensive commerce of antiquity. There is nothing left in art, literature or government to tell the story of the Phenician colonies; Grecian art and literature have endured. There is not a civilized country in the world which has not felt the refining influence of Grecian art and literature, and there is hardly one that has not been influenced by Grecian philosophy and democracy. From their earliest history, the Greeks have been devoted to constitutional government and popular rights, centuries of subjection to the Turks could not destroy their ideals and patriotism, and the late social and political renaissance of Greece has won the admiration of the world.

History teaches us that the greatness of a nation is not in its population, the extent of its territory, its wealth, nor its military power. "Greatness is of the soul, not of the body"; it is the spiritual life, not the evidence of things material. There is such a thing as national conscience and the ethics and humanity of a nation are full of potentialities in its political and industrial life. There is no administrative machinery, no courts for enforcing the law of nations, and, until we make further progress in the federation of nations, we must rely upon the fundamental principles of justice and honor, supported by enlightened public opinion. The injustice, and inhumanity, and the lawless cupidity of individuals frequently escape punishment by the courts, but the condemnation of public opinion is frequently more effective as punitive justice, and a more wholesome deterrent, than rigid enforcement of the written law. And history teaches us that nations also are frequently and severely punished by this moral force of public opinion; there is such a thing as retributive justice in the unwritten law of nations. The highest evidence of the moral progress of a nation, and the cultured standard of its peoples, is found not only in a keen regard for its treaty obligations, but also in an equal regard for human rights and justice.

The Monroe Doctrine was promulgated not only for our own protection, but more directly for the protection and preservation of the new South American states. Our liberal treatment of Spain in the Treaty of Paris; our conduct towards Cuba; our liberal treatment of China in the matter of the Boxer troubles, and our policy with Mexico are evidences of our national conscience. Japan's liberal treatment of Russia and her high regard for her treaty obligations, her dignified conduct since she defeated Russia, have won the confidence and respect of the world. Russia was deeply humiliated and seriously checked in her plans for territorial expansion; Japan was exhilarated, greatly extended her commerce and acquired large territory, but her success did not make her inhuman and

insolent. If the policy of Japan since the war with Russia may be taken as evidence of the "Yellow Peril," it is a pity that this peril did not infect Germany. Had the Japanese peril gotten into the head and heart of Germany immediately following the war with France, forty-four years ago, it would have been better for the peace of the world, the cause of civilization and the honor of Germany. It has been forty-four years since France was humiliated and plundered by Germany and Germany's bitterness and enmity towards the victim of her intrigue and insatiable rapacity has not abated. It has been only ten years since Japan and Russia were at war; today there is no apparent bitterness between these two powers and they are the common allies of the two most advanced nations of the world. Our war with Spain deprived that proud nation of its richest possessions, but there is no bitterness or enmity between Spain and the United States. German writers sneer at us and say our policy with Cuba, China and Mexico has been weak; in the judgment of other civilized people, our policies in these matters have evidenced a national consciousness which has exalted us in world position.

England has many sins to answer for. Like every other nation, Great Britain has not always shown a scrupulous regard for her obligations and her greed has sometimes led her too far, but she stands before the world today with the oldest and most honorable record as the defender of human rights, the champion of national ethics and the conservator of democracy and civilization. It has been England's national virtue and England's greatness, more than England's commercial supremacy, that has aroused the hatred of Germany. We have read, when a clownish fellow approached Aristides, not knowing him, asked that his name be written on the sherd of ostracism, Aristides was surprised and asked if he had ever done him any injury. "None at all," said he, "neither know I the man; but I am tired of hearing him everywhere called the just." And we have been told that the devil hates holy water, simply because it is holy. England has other rivals for the world's trade. America has been a very formidable rival, and there have been many delicate and grave questions, involving our trade relations, which we have been called upon to settle with England. Sometimes we have thought she was grasping and unreasonable, but for more than one hundred years, we have been able to find a peaceable and honorable settlement of all our difficulties.

We have been told that Germany is jealous of England's naval supremacy, but we know that England's naval supremacy existed before Germany had emerged from the limitations of her tribal communities, long before the German people dreamed they were capable of maintaining a navy. France and America are more exposed to attack from the sea than Germany, but neither of these countries has gone into a state of hysteria about the growth of England's navy. Another ridiculous and undignified position taken by Germany is that England is jealous of Ger-

many's trade expansion. There has been no more occasion for England's being jealous of German trade than American trade, and England has put no more stumbling blocks in the way of German trade than she has put in the way of American trade. America and France have been in active competition with England in the South American trade and with English colonies. Since the beginning of the present war, the United States has been "looking around pretty smartly," doing "her level best" to pick up all the trade she can find. Systematic work has been undertaken by our merchants and manufacturers to secure a large portion of the South American trade which has been wholly lost to Germany and temporarily and partly lost to England and France. We anticipate no war as a result of our merchants and manufacturers seeking new fields for trade, and we have not heard that their efforts have aroused any bitterness in France or England.

England has not discriminated against German trade; she has made no effort to retard German industrial progress or handicap German trade. In the words of A. Maurice Low, "While Germany has built a wall of tariffs against England, England has thrown the doors to her market places wide open. . . . Germany found in the United Kingdom and the British dominions and dependencies her richest and most profitable markets, and through her own folly Germany has lost a trade she can never recover."

Germany's alarm about English trade rivalry was founded on the general moral law that a dishonest man hates an honest man. While Germany has been able to compete with England in many lines she has not been able to destroy confidence in English wares and English integrity. Germany's methods do not inspire permanent confidence. The trade situation as between the two countries has been clearly stated by Prof. Roland G. Usher, Professor of History, Washington University: "No small part of England's success in international trade has been the ability of the English manufacturers to maintain a standard that is almost unvarying. The English products which bear the great names have been the same for generations, and the proprietors have never yielded to the temptation to debase the product to increase the profit. They have sought to increase profit by the extension of operations and the increased volume of sales. . . . Merchants in the far-off quarters of the world know exactly what they are ordering and exactly what it will be like when they receive it, and they are never disappointed."

F. von Bernhardi writes of "the great tasks of the present and future which Providence has set before the German people as the greatest civilized people known to history." The arrogance of the German writers is something unspeakable. Bernhardi fails to tell just what these great tasks are which Providence has set before His chosen people, but if we consult another German authority we shall learn

more about the elect people and their tasks. The Outlook of Aug. 22nd. publishes a very interesting article under the title of "Germany Interpreted by a German-American." Referring to this article, the Editors of The Outlook say: "The following article comes to us from the pen of an American citizen of German parentage. An alumnus of a well-known eastern preparatory school and a distinguished graduate of Harvard University." Among other frank and interesting statements in this article, I find the following:

"There are, of course, potent though superficial reasons for this general dislike of the German. The average German, whom the foreigner sees, is aggressive, self-assertive, loud in his manner and talk, inconsiderate, petty, pompous, dictatorial, without humor; in a word, bumptious. He has, in many cases, exceedingly bad table manners and an almost gross enjoyment of his food; and he talks about his ailments and his underwear. His attitude towards women, moreover, is likely to be over-gallant if he knows them a little and not too well, and discourteous or even insolent if he is married to them or does not know them at all. He is at his worst at the time when he is most on exhibition, when he is on his travels or helping other people to travel, as ticket-chopper or custom official." This is a graphic picture of the chosen people of God, the "greatest civilized people known to history." We have at least one German-American who understands the situation and has the frankness to tell the truth in very plain language.

After reading this perfect description of the average German, we can well appreciate the magnitude of the task to which Providence has set His chosen people. This task is to coerce the world into an understanding and proper appreciation of the German people. This task is, indeed, a mighty undertaking which Providence has set before His people. The world must learn to appreciate bumptious people who have bad table manners and who are insolent to their wives and women they do not know very well. In considering so serious a matter, we should be neither facetious nor sacrilegious, but we can hardly refrain from remarking that Providence has never before imposed so difficult a task on His elect. Had we not been told that this is a God-appointed task, we should question the possibility of the venture meeting with success. The people of the allied nations are appalled at the prospect when they are further told by this writer in The Outlook, "The Dutchman's back is against the wall . . . though devils should rise against us on all sides . . . still we should fight to the end." If this be the furor Teutonicus, the ultimatum and challenge to civilization,—"Then welcome be Cumberland's steed to the shock."

This eminent German-American further tells us, "politically, Germany was isolated by Edward VII, but socially the German people have always been isolated." When we consider the late propaganda

of the German people, it is not surprising that they have been politically isolated, although Bernhardi has said that the German people are "the greatest civilized people known to history." The world is deeply indebted to Edward VII. He came from the house of Hanover, a German family. It took three generations of English association to refine and anglicize the Guelph family, but from the beginning of the reign of Victoria it has been intensely English. Edward VII was a polished Englishman, broad and statesmanlike and, in his efforts to isolate Germany, no doubt he recalled the policy and the words of Frederick the Great who said: "He is a fool, and that nation is a fool, who, having the power to strike his enemy unawares, does not strike and strike his deadliest."

Accepting this picture of German character, temperament and manners, so vividly presented by a learned German-American, we are not surprised to hear that the German has been always socially isolated, and we shall not be surprised if he should continue in social isolation. If we search for the cause of his political isolation we shall find it in the philosophy of Nietzsche and Bernhardi and the policies of Frederick the Great and Kaiser William II. If Germany were politically isolated by Edward VII, we know it was not done by force of arms, but by the inherent superiority of the people and institutions which Edward VII represented. Individuals sometimes buy their way into polite society, but brigands have never been able to fight their way into respectability. If bushwhacking were the road to social prominence the Apaches and Moros would be the leaders of polite society.

Modern German writers find nothing to appreciate in English literature or English statesmanship. In the judgment of Treitschke, "Macaulay exhibits a lack of philosophic culture that absolutely amazes us Germans. He says things that with us no student would dare say." Macaulay was not a philosopher and as an historian he was partisan; however, it is not surprising that Germans who so devoutly accept the doctrine of divine right should find nothing in Macaulay's History which they can appreciate. Nor is it remarkable that the disciples of Nietzsche should find nothing to appreciate in Macaulay's judgment of Milton, and the "lofty disdain with which he looked down on temptations and dangers, the deadly hatred which he bore to bigots and tyrants, and the faith which he so sternly kept with his country and with his fame." We could hardly expect the followers of Bernhardi to appreciate Macaulay's essay on John Bunyan, and his essay on the Earl of Chatham would not interest the average German who, we are informed, "is petty, pompous and dictatorial." When the elder Pitt, "the great commoner," was pleading the cause of the American colonists, when men, women and children of Boston, "high and low, rich and poor, joined in the chorus: Pitt and liberty," the petty states

of the Holy Roman Empire were in the embryo of nationality and the German people were listening to chickadee stories in the kindergarten of civilization. It has been said that the destinies of France "have been moulded by men's love for women," and that "nature bred a type of women fit to mate with the imaginative man." The brave and beautiful of France are united for self-preservation; they stand at Armageddon to meet the mighty hordes of German vandals who "have a gross enjoyment of their food" and who are "insolent to their wives and women they do not know." The world stands aghast at the dangers that beset the French and their institutions. "In France, especially, the centre of thought, enthusiasm, and war, from the mighty fane of Paris downward, the churches were dedicated to Mary, and the vow of chivalry bound the knight to fight for God and for his lady." This is the France that has been invaded by the vandals who are "petty, dictatorial and inconsiderate," who are "insolent to their wives and women they do not know and who have a gross enjoyment of their food." All lower animals appear to "have a gross enjoyment of their food."

Shall we remain silent and indifferent to the dangers that beset France? Have we forgotten Lafayette and Rochambeau? Have we forgotten the story of the dramatic scene when, with Franklin and John Adams, "Voltaire was solemnly received by the French Academy and philosophic France gave the right hand of fellowship to America as its child of adoption"? The historian says: "Many causes combined to procure the alliance of France and the American republic; but the force which brought all influences harmoniously together, overruling the timorous levity of Maurepas and the dull reluctance of Louis XVI, was the moment of intellectual freedom. The spirit of free inquiry penetrated the Catholic world as it penetrated the Protestant world."

The world, and America in particular, owes much to France. She has given freely of her best blood for the cause of humanity and the wisdom of her statesmen have guided and directed all peoples in search of human liberty. Her science has mitigated human suffering and prolonged life, her art has made the world more beautiful and delightful to live in, and her literature has amused and entertained, and it has instructed and mellowed mankind in all parts of the civilized world. Shall we here in America surrender de Tocqueville and adopt Bernhardt? Shall we cease to tell our children the story of Danton, Rouget de L'isle and Madam Roland? Shall we no longer arouse the idealism and quicken the lofty aspiration of our children with Chateaubriand and Rousseau? Shall we tell them that Nietzsche builded better than Hugo and that Bernhardt is greater than Thiers? Is the mighty War Lord of Germany a more learned, a wiser or better

ruler than that gentle and beloved man of the people, President Poincaré?

Are we not in danger of being drawn into this mighty maelstrom? Have we not had sufficient warning? The policies of Frederick the Great and Bismarck are a part of the world's history. We have seen Belgium struck down without warning, her splendid civilization trampled under foot and her brave people sacrificed on the altar of liberty, we have seen the devastation of France where the invading vandal has been able to penetrate and the very existence of this nation at hazard. England and her colonies are sending the flower of their land for the cause of humanity, Russia is advancing, united and with promises of greater liberty to her faithful people, and Japan is fighting in the common cause of humanity. Austria, Germany and Turkey are the mighty hordes arrayed, today as they have been in the past, against humanity.

Shall we stand idle in this wreck and ruin of civilization, indifferent to threatened destruction of the people who are our kin and the institutions from which our civilization has been evolved? Shall we not take heed, lest the only barrier between us and the mighty sweep of German vandalism be broken down? Will it be well for us when English democracy is supplanted by German absolutism, when the beauties of English literature are marred by German materialism and the comfort of English spiritualism and associations give way before German coarseness and brutality?

When George III came to the English throne he undertook to restore absolutism of the Stuarts with his "rotten borough" system and other corrupt practices. George III was a stupid and vulgar German and his methods were essentially Germanic, his mental derangement was such that he became hopelessly insane. During the reign of George III, England was not so far advanced in democracy, nor so far removed from the dogma of divine right, that she could grant the just demands of the American colonies. But in those days, with a corrupt and mediaeval ruler on the throne, the principles of representative government were firmly established in the English constitution, and in all respects England was further advanced in civilization than other nations, the will of the sovereign was not the sentiment and judgment of the people and the people did not hesitate to make their wishes known. Our colonial fathers were not without friends at court and, not only America, but the world owes a great debt to England's greatest statemen, Pitt, Burke, and others who so ably and fearlessly advocated the cause of democracy. Shall we forget the people who have been the conservators of human liberty, who from the Magna Charta to the Home Rule Bill, have steadily advanced in the cause of representative government and civilization?

For more than two hundred years, the principles of representative government have followed the English flag. Wherever the English flag has appeared, the principles of representative government have taken root and while the growth has been slow it has never been uprooted where the British flag remained. Every period of English history, from Milton and Cromwell, Hampden and Bunyan, to Lloyd George, Churchill, Asquith, Grey, Roberts and Kitchener, and other great leaders who are today standing for humanity, has been filled with words and deeds which have been an incentive to the youth of this country, a solace to patriots in all parts of the world. The poor and oppressed, the unfortunate and needy, from famished India, desolate Africa, from oppressed Germany and the far East, have turned to England for comfort and help; and the persecuted of all races have found asylum in England where they were secure in life and liberty.

In words and deeds the English people have shown their sympathy for the oppressed of all races and during many years they have given protection and material aid to those engaged in democratic struggles for humanity. To the Balkan States and Greece they have extended a helping hand, and the stand which Great Britain took under Lord Palmerston was in sympathy with the Italian people in their struggle for liberty and enabled Cavour to drive the Austrians from Italy. England opposed the war of Austria and Prussia against Denmark in 1864 and the English people have been sincerely sympathetic with democratic struggles in all parts of the world. For more than two hundred years Great Britain has sheltered Christendom. Shall we see this "lofty tree, under whose shade the nations of the earth have reposed, deprived of its branches, and the sapless trunk left to wither on the ground"?

This war is a willful and premeditated attack on democratic institutions of the most highly cultivated races in every part of the world. Germany has been flaunting her military for a generation and, all along, she has been arrogant and bumptious; it has been offensive and dangerous, and civilization has grown tired of the strain. Austria is archaic and effete. The hope of civilization is that this mighty struggle will end in the annihilation of the Hapsburg and Hohenzollern dynasties, and that the unfortunate subjects of those autocracies will be able to establish something in the form of a constitutional government by the people.

Neither the Austro-Hungarian, nor the German Empire, represents anything in its civic or political code which appeals to the ideals of the American people. The house of Hapsburg has been a most persistent and merciless enemy of republican institutions. Its history, for seven centuries, has been a tragic story of continuing and aggressive warfare against political liberty and civic uplift of the people; it has

fought every reform and every democratic movement in Europe since the twelfth century. The history of the Hohenzollern family has been but little better than the Hapsburg. If anyone doubt the dogmatic superstition and dangerous policies of the present head of the Hohenzollern family, let him read these words, spoken by the Kaiser to his soldiers: "Remember that the German people are the chosen of God. On me, as German Emperor, the spirit of God has descended. I am His weapon, His sword and His vice regent. Woe to the disobedient, death to the cowards and unbelievers."

Is this the dogma of the German people, the shibboleth of the German army? We must so regard it because it is the dictum of German lordship and we find it written in blood where the German army has invaded Belgium. It is difficult for an American citizen of ordinary intelligence to comprehend the words of the German kaiser, and we can hardly believe the evidence which has been furnished in support of the charges which have been made against the German army. We are told that the Kaiser is greatly admired and beloved by his people. His words and his deeds are before us and there is no conflict in his declarations and his acts.

His words may be the dogma of the German war party. They do not represent the thought or sentiment of Kant, the great philosopher, whose "fidelity to human freedom has never been questioned and never can be." "The rights of man," he said, "are dear to God, are the apple of the eye of God on earth." And the words of the Kaiser are not the thoughts of Lessing, who said: "The chief of a commonwealth, governing a free people by their free choice, has a halo that never surrounded a king." And Herder said, "The boldest, most godlike thoughts of the human mind, the most beautiful and greatest works, have been perfected in republics; not only in antiquity, but in the mediaeval and more modern times, the best history, the best philosophy of humanity and government, is always republican; and the republic exerts its influence, not by direct intervention, but mediately by its mere existence." Klopstock "beheld in the American war the inspiration of humanity and the dawn of an approaching great day." Goethe, Germany's greatest writer and one of the greatest of the world, "classed the Boston tea-party of 1773 among the prodigious events which stamped themselves most deeply on his mind in childhood." He wished the Americans success, and "the names of Franklin and Washington shone and sparkled in his heaven of politics and war." The absolutism and coarseness and brutality of the German Kaiser finds no support in the teachings of the truly great men of Germany.

The doctrine of the German Emperor of today expresses the faith

and policies of Mohammed the Great; in fact, the language of the Kaiser is substantially the words of that mighty sultan of six hundred years ago. It is the religion of the Spanish Inquisition, the fanaticism of the dervishes who were destroyed by Kitchener at Omdurman. And the military genius who vanquished the dervishes will be one of the potent agencies in ridding the world of this German fanatic.

A people who accept, and offer their lives in defense of, such dangerous doctrines can not be highly civilized. But it is the shibboleth of the German army and it is not surprising that an army fighting in such a campaign and under such leadership should be easily provoked to frenzy, perpetrating the most revolting cruelties. No American, to the manner born, who retains a spark of virile patriotism, can give aid or sympathy to a people or nation supporting so pernicious a doctrine as the Kaiser has promulgated. Nor can any good American, with any degree of self-respect, listen to the advocates of a dogma which strikes at the very foundation of American institutions. German arrogance and militarism have no place in modern civilization; the blood and iron policy is no less offensive to our social institutions than to our liberties. Dollars and guns, which have been so extensively advertised as German policy, supported by Hohenzollern fanaticism, do not appeal to the highest ideals of the American people.

The armed propagandism of the German Emperor is a menace to the peace of the world; a threat against democratic principles of government in all parts of the world. Against this propaganda of divine right, with all its consequent ills, the English speaking people have been fighting since the time of Cromwell. The eloquence of Patrick Henry, the Statute for Religious Freedom and the Declaration of Independence were all directed against this doctrine. It is a relic of medievalism, ignorance, superstition and serfdom, and its last vestige of respectability vanished with the passing of the Holy Roman Empire. Among many other good things which the French Revolution did for the cause of humanity was the complete annihilation of the Holy Roman Empire. The last effort to revive that obsolete dogmatism was a few weeks after Waterloo, when the emperors of Austria, Russia and the king of Prussia were at Paris. Alexander, of Russia, "spent entire days at Paris, to the exclusion of all other business, in mystical communication of sentiments with Madame de Krudener," a pietist. The result of the influence of that fanatic was the Treaty of the Holy Alliance. The answer of the liberty loving English speaking people, supported by Great Britain, was the Monroe Doctrine. This Monroe Doctrine is a vital question of American policy today, and it is opposed to German absolutism and present policy of German expansion.

The situation in Europe has been very clearly and prophetically stated by Winston Churchill in these words: "Now the impact is on us. Our blood which flows in your veins should lead you to expect that we shall be stubborn enough to bear the impact. But if we go down and are swept in ruin into the past, you are the next.

"This war is for us a war of honor, of respect for obligations, into which we have entered, and of loyalty towards friends in desperate need. But now that it has begun, it has become a war of self-preservation. The British democracy, with its limited monarchy, its ancient parliament, its ardent social and philanthropic systems, is engaged for good or for ill in a deadly grapple with the formidable might of Prussian autocratic rule."

Since the beginning of this war, the press, in certain sections of the United States, largely under German-American influence, has been crammed with German propagandism. When war was declared, a great demonstration was held in Chicago and hyphenated Americans sent expressions of sympathy and support to the imperial government in Germany. Neither English, French, Belgian or Russian, in the United States found it necessary or advisable to talk so much or to print so much in defense of the policies of either of these countries. The query naturally suggests itself: Why have the German-Americans found it necessary to talk so much and publish so much in defense of a government the principles and practices of which are so dangerous to American institutions?

When the reports of the appalling atrocities in Belgium reached this country, we had another deluge of newspaper articles from German-Americans, who were four-thousand miles from where the alleged atrocities occurred. When a commission from a sovereign state came to this country they were properly received by the president. This commission presented specific charges, in a formal and proper manner. German-Americans who could not be competent witnesses, simply because they have no personal knowledge of the matter under consideration, came forward with demands for further hearing. It was conveniently arranged for lengthy articles, from correspondents of Chicago papers, to appear in print a few hours after the Belgian Commission had filed its indictments. These newspaper articles were written by correspondents of intelligence, experience and integrity, but not one of these articles contains a categorical answer to a single charge which has been made. Neither of the correspondents, according to his own statement, had an opportunity, or did not avail himself of an opportunity, to investigate one of the accusations that has been made. These writers have simply reported impressions and opinions. They have graphically, and in the most fulsome manner,

extolled the gracious hospitality of the German army officers. This evidence of affable demeanor and considerate attention to American guests is no answer to the specific charges. Moreover, other writers of long experience and international reputation of ability and integrity, have testified to the evidence of cruelty and vandalism which have come under their personal observation. Richard Harding Davis was an eye-witness to the razing of Louvain. From the pathetic story he has told, I take the following:

"For two hours Thursday night I was in what for 600 years had been the city of Louvain. The Germans were burning it and to hide their work kept us locked in the railroad carriages, but the story was written against the sky and was told to us by the German soldiers, incoherent with excess. We could read it in the faces of the women and children being led to concentration camps to be shot. Like flocks of sheep, they were rounded up and marched through the night to concentration camps. We were not allowed to speak to any citizen of Louvain, but the Germans crowded the windows, boastful, gloating, eager to interpret.

"No one defends the sniper, but because the ignorant Mexicans, when their city was invaded, fired upon our sailors we did not destroy Vera Cruz. Even had we bombarded Vera Cruz money could have restored it. Money can not restore Louvain and its people's handiwork belonging to the world. With torch and dynamite the Germans have turned their masterpieces into ashes and all the Kaiser's horses and all his men can not bring them back again."

The Duke of Alva, who pillaged Belgium more than three hundred years ago, came from an illustrious family and was educated in military science and politics, with all the accomplishments of a Spanish grandee. His hospitality to Counts Egmont and Hoorne were according to the regal custom of that period; the murder of his guests was according to the cruel and cowardly practices of that ferocious and vindictive grandee. The inhuman Alva was always debonair, even when he directed the "Council of Blood." So was Mohammed II, a man of education; he spoke five languages fluently and was well versed in the natural sciences and fine arts. It is little comfort to the homeless and bereaved of Belgium to learn that their homes were burned and their aged kin murdered under the direction of German army officers who had been educated and trained in the art of entertaining.

The world's verdict on the bloody Alva was expressed by Motley in these words: "Such an amount of stealth and ferocity, of patient vindictiveness, and universal bloodthirstiness has never been found in a savage beast of the forest, and but rarely in a human being." When

the verdict of the world is made up on the record of the war lord of Germany, who calls himself the vice regent and weapon of God, upon whom the spirit of God has descended, he will be placed in the same class of ferocious vandals as the Duke of Alva. Attila, Alva and William II, of Germany, have been the scourge of the Low Countries.

The present afflictions of the Belgians are the result of no aggression, infringement or encroachment on their part. They are the innocent victims sacrificed in a ruthless breach of the most sacred obligation which a nation can enter into, an obligation which has been held to be the supreme law of a sovereign state. Belgium is small in area but large in history. Caesar said, "The Belgians are the bravest of all," and for two thousand years they have held an important place in history. They have been thrifty in peace and brave in war and have made their place in history. We respect the Belgians for the history they have made; we deeply sympathize with these brave people in their present distress and bereavement and we honor them for their heroic devotion to their country and their honor. The brutal violation of Belgian neutrality will live in history as the most appalling crime of the century.

The scene of the present struggle in Europe was a great battle field in a conflict between the Belgian and French ancestors and the Huns, under the leadership of Attila, "the scourge of God." And there are several points of striking similarity, not only in the location of the conflict, but also in the avowed purpose and in the cruel practices of the invading vandals. There is an impressive and pathetic similarity in the vandalism of "the scourge of God" fifteen hundred years ago, and the vice regent and weapon of God today. Removed from the present environment of civilization, the vice regent of God is the twin brother of the "scourge of God." A common Tartar ancestry seems evident and the anthropologist could easily trace the house of Hohenzollern back to the most distinguished king of the Huns.

There has been no manifestation of prejudice against the German people in this country. They are thrifty and progressive, their educational development, industrial and commercial expansion and their efficiency in administration are fully appreciated. But the people of the German Empire are the subjects of a bigoted autocrat who has no respect for treaty obligations, the law of nations, or any other legal or moral obligation which stands in the way of his aggressive militarism. We have sincere sympathy for Germans in this country who have kin and friends in the German army, but we have little charity for those who call themselves American citizens while they support the dogmas and practices of the German government. Those who can not support the American government, who can not be faithful, in

words and deeds, to our institutions, should return to their native country. The newspapers report that 5,000 German-Americans, at a meeting in New York, "hailed the day when the German flag should fly over Paris and London." There is no present occasion for apprehension at the prospect of the German flag flying over Paris and London, but the suggestion is offensive to the American people. Hyphenated Americans who would like to see the German flag flying over Paris and London ought to leave this country and try to put the flag where they want it. No patriotic American wants to see the German flag flying over Paris and London.

Our sympathy with the Allies is evidence of our faith in democratic institutions and our desire to encourage and support every effort to establish and maintain republican form of government. German absolutism and militarism are a menace to the principles which our fathers proclaimed at Philadelphia and defended at Bunker Hill and Cowpens. We believe in democracy; Bernhardt says, "There never have been, and never will be, universal rights of men." England, France and Belgium are fighting the battles of democracy and civilization, against German teachings and German policies. When our fathers established this government, they abrogated the obsolete doctrine of divine right and the teachings of the absolutist, and in place of these despotic measures which had so long oppressed mankind, they set up the sovereign citizen. Having successfully combated the ancient fetish of divine right, we have turned our attention to the modern fetish of materialism which has eaten the soul of the German people and threatens the life of this nation. With the advancing intelligence of our citizens, and a courageous faith in the potentialities of democracy, we hope to be able to maintain the stability of our government and to overcome the aggressive forces of materialism.

German espionage obtains in every part of this country, as it has in every other country where it has not been suppressed; it is a present peril which is a menace to our peace and security. German leagues in this country are attacking our democratic system, ridiculing our Congress and directing the influence of powerful industrial combinations in support of men and measures dangerous to our government. German-American leagues whose members are American citizens, qualified electors who have full protection of our government and all possible advantages of our industrial growth, are systematically directing their efforts along lines that threaten the peace of the nation. We are not prepared to meet an open foe. Under the blessings of peace, we have not prepared for war. In the present crisis we should prepare for any eventualities, and we should suppress with public opinion, and stronger measures, if any be necessary, this anti-democratic, anti-

American spirit which is being used in the interest of Germany. A spirit of American patriotism should be aroused which will destroy, or at least silence, our enemies within and prepare to meet enemies who may come from without. Let us not feel too secure in our liberties nor too boastful in the potentialities of our vast resources and population. When Nehemiah was rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem many evil tidings came to him, and many threats were made by Sanballat and Tobiah who mocked the Jews. "And it came to pass from that time forth, that half of my servants wrought in the work and half of them held the spears, the shields, and the bows, and the coats of mail. . . . Every one with one of his hands wrought in the work, and with the other held his weapon." We should take warning and while we build we should be prepared for all possible contingencies.

This is a war in the interest of imperialism and for the extension of territory and the expansion of trade. We can not disregard the responsibilities of the situation, nor will we be able to escape its general effect. Our government was instituted on the broad, democratic principle, "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." We believe that we have established the wisdom and administrative efficiency of our principle of government, and that we have shown, by experience and practical demonstration, that it is possible for all civilized, white races to live together in peace, under democratic institutions and a common republican form of government. Indeed, under the necessities of our situation, we have undertaken to show that the operation of our principle and form of government need not be limited to the white races. This expansion of our theory to include all races is yet in an experimental stage, but the principle and policy has been supported by many of our ablest statesmen and we have sacrificed many valuable lives and great treasure in order to write the expansion of this principle into our organic law. We have taken these fundamental principles of government to Cuba and the Philippine Islands and we are trying to establish them in Mexico. If our theories are not correct and can not be maintained on a stable basis, our government is a monumental failure. As a nation we must, for the present, be neutral; if we still have faith in republican form of government, we can not be neutral in our sympathies.

God has appointed no vice regent in this country, nor do we believe that we are the chosen people of God; charity is God's vice regent—truth, virtue and liberty His only weapons in this country. The

sword will be placed in the hand of no man, except by the will of the people. In the most troublous period of this nation's history there came from the people a Christ-like man, who published and practised the doctrine of "malice toward none, with charity for all." In the life of that illustrious man this nation found "a new birth of freedom" and a resolve "that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." The vice regent of God who sacked Louvain will find no place in the hearts of the people who revere the memory of Abraham Lincoln.

"Thermopylae had her messenger of defeat; the Alamo had none." If in the story of those heroic deeds we find an inspiration, what splendid monuments will be built on the ruins of Louvain; and in the hearts of our children the memory of the men who fell at Liege will be an incentive to the highest ideals of a brave and cultured people. If it be true that a land without ruins is a land without memories, what eloquent memories are found in the land of the Belgians.

"The triumphs of might are transient—they pass and are forgotten—the sufferings of right are graven deepest on the chronicle of nations."

"For out of the gloom future brightness is born,
As after the night comes the sunrise of morn;
And the graves of the dead with the grass overgrown
May yet form the footstool of liberty's throne,
And each single wreck in the war-path of might,
Shall yet be a rock in the temple of right."

With Red Eyes

(Reprinted by permission of The Outlook.)

Those who are dwelling in the track of a forest fire have little inclination to theorize upon the chemical phenomenon that is transforming their homes into gray ash. Fire is to them a terror that flies both by night and by day, a demon to be fought that life itself may endure.

In such a time of dread, conduct is not so much a matter of formula as of emotion. We can judge the lives of fire-fighters and fire-fleers only when we know the measure of their passion.

For us who watch the consuming devastation in Europe from the vantage-point of a neutral country, there is oftentimes the temptation

of passing a too academic judgment upon the motives of the belligerents. We weigh white paper against white, orange with gray, and then, secure in our own opinions, wonder why our conclusions are not universally accepted. From passionate people we demand cool logic. In frenzy we look for ordered reason. From eyes red with hate we ask judicial vision.

Hate and passion we can indeed appraise at their true worth—condemning or sustaining the justifications offered for their existence, according to the evidence of history. None the less is it true that, if we ourselves would see clearly, we cannot simply choose to ignore the direct expression of these national passions and national hates. They are, indeed, a vital element in the Story of the War.

That is why in this place we print two poems. One is by Ernst Lissauer, translated from "Jugend" by Barbara Henderson, and recently published in the New York "Times"; the other is by Henry Chappell, a name that may be familiar to some of our readers as that of the "railway poet of Bath."

A Chant of Hate Against England

By Ernst Lissauer in "Jugend"

Rendered into English verse by Barbara Henderson

Reprinted from the New York "Times"

French and Russian, they matter not,
A blow for a blow and a shot for a shot;
We love them not, we hate them not,
We hold the Weichsel and Vosges-gate,
We have but one and only hate,
We love as one, we hate as one,
We have one foe and one alone.

He is known to you all, he is known to you all,
He crouches behind the dark-gray flood,
Full of envy, of rage, of craft, of gall,
Cut off by waves that are thicker than blood.
Come, let us stand at the Judgment place,
An oath to swear to, face to face,
An oath of bronze no wind can shake,
An oath for our sons and their sons to take.

Come, hear the word, repeat the word,
Throughout the Fatherland make it heard.
We will never forego our hate,
We have all but a single hate
We love as one, we hate as one,
We have one foe and one alone—

ENGLAND!

In the captain's mess, in the banquet-hall,
Sat feasting the officers, one and all,
Like a saber blow, like the swing of a sail,
One seized his glass held high to hail;
Sharp-snapped like the stroke of a rudder's play,
Spoke three words only: "To the Day!"
Whose glass this fate?
They had all but a single hate.
Who was thus known?
They had one foe and one alone—

ENGLAND!

Take you the folk of the earth in pay,
With bars of gold your ramparts lay,
Bedeck the ocean with bow on bow,
Ye reckon well, but not well enough now.
French and Russian, they matter not,
A blow for a blow, a shot for a shot,
We fight the battle with bronze and steel,
And the time that is coming Peace will seal.
You will we hate with a lasting hate,
We will never forego our hate,
Hate by water and hate by land,
Hate of the head and hate of the hand,
Hate of the hammer and hate of the crown,
Hate of seventy millions, choking down.
We love as one, we hate as one,
We have one foe and one alone—

ENGLAND!

The Day

By Henry Chappell

You boasted the Day, and you toasted the Day,
And now the Day has come;
Blasphemer, braggart, and coward all,
Little you reck of the numbing ball,
The blasting shell, or the "White arm's" fall,
As they speed poor humans home.

You spied for the Day, you lied for the Day,
And woke the Day's red spleen;
Monster, who asked God's aid divine,
Then strewed His seas with the ghastly mine—
Not all the waters of all the Rhine
Can wash thy foul hands clean.

You dreamed for the Day, you schemed for the Day,
Watch how the Day will go;
Slayer of age and youth and prime
(Defenseless slain for never a crime),
Thou art steeped in blood as a hog in slime—
False friend and cowardly foe.

You have sown for the Day, you have grown for the Day,
Yours is the Harvest red;
Can you hear the groans and the awful cries?
Can you see the heap of the slain that lies,
And sightless turned to the flame-split skies
The glassy eyes of the dead?

You have longed for the Day, you have wronged for the Day
That lit the awful flame.
'Tis nothing to you that hill and plain
Yield sheaves of dead men amid the grain;
That widows mourn for their loved ones slain,
And mothers curse thy name!

But after the Day there's a price to pay
For the sleepers under the sod;
And He you have mocked for many a day—
Listen, and hear what he has to say:

"Vengeance is mine, I will repay."
What can you say to God?

(Reprinted from The Outlook, of Sept. 9, 1914.)

Louvain

The destruction of Louvain by an unknown German military commander is an act of brutality absolutely unjustified by the rules of war. Nor is it any excuse for this act of brutality to say that war is brutal. Civilized war is cruel, but not brutal. The difference between a man and a brute is that the brute acts under impulse, guided only by his instincts, while the man guides his action by intelligence. The cruelty of civilized war is an intelligent cruelty—that is, it is cruelty directed by intelligence to a definite purpose. Any cruelty in war not so directed is justly termed brutal. We do not attempt in this article to judge acts in war by the ethical standards accepted in times of peace. We judge warlike actions by war standards. To all Americans familiar with military literature the volume of General W. E. Birkhimer, of the United States General Staff, on "Military Government and Martial Law" will be recognized as an authority. The principles assumed in this editorial are derived from and based on this volume.

The object in war is the destruction of the enemy's army. Any military acts necessary for the destruction of the enemy's army are in general justified by military law—that is, by the customs of civilized nations. Any acts not directly tending to aid in the destruction of the enemy's army are unjustified.

The destruction of Louvain had no tendency to promote the objects which the German army has in view. It was an unintelligent act of vandalism. Therefore it was an act of brutality.

The destruction of Louvain did nothing to aid the army of invasion. For Louvain was not a strategic point which might be of advantage to the armies of the Allies if it was left intact.

The destruction of Louvain did nothing to weaken the army of the Allies. It added strength to them; for it has filled the Belgians and the French with an enthusiasm of wrath, and enthusiasm of wrath adds greatly to the fighting force of an army.

The destruction of Louvain did nothing to protect European civilization from the Slav. On the contrary, it has aroused in the Slav a spirit of revenge, and Germans are fleeing from Berlin in fear of Russia's retaliation.

The destruction of Louvain has done nothing to aid Germany to make herself a world power. By that destruction she has aroused the indignation of the civilized world, an indignation which will outlast this terrible war. This is not the way to secure a world power.

The destruction of Louvain has done nothing to unite Germany against a united Europe. On the contrary, it has brought from the

Berlin Socialist "Vorwaerts" a protest which warns the Germans against putting the struggle in a wrong light in the eyes of all the world and which calls upon the working class who are fighting at the front to remember their brethren on the other side and behave toward them in chivalrous manner. It is safe to assume that no paper in Germany would venture to suggest such a protest if it did not voice the sentiment of a considerable section of the German people.

The defense offered for this act of vandalism is that civilians, after Louvain was occupied by the German army, shot German soldiers, and the city was destroyed as an act of reprisal. The shooting of soldiers in an occupied town by unorganized civilians is an act of murder, and should be treated accordingly. But the criminal acts of a few individuals do not justify the destruction of a city. Says the Hague Conventions (Section 3, Article I): "No general penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, can be inflicted on the population on account of the acts of individuals, for which it cannot be regarded as collectively responsible." And in this declaration the Hague Conventions simply affirmed concisely a principle recognized by the customs of civilized nations in warfare.

The wave of indignation which has swept over America because of this criminal act cannot be regarded as an anti-German prejudice. Our soldiers when in occupation of Vera Cruz were shot at and killed by civilians. By vigorous police measures this "sniping" was speedily stopped. If the American troops had burned Vera Cruz, the American indignation would have far exceeded any indignation which Americans have thus far expressed at the act of the German troops in Louvain, and yet the loss to the world in the destruction of the beautiful city of Louvain far exceeds any loss that would have been suffered by the destruction of Vera Cruz. And if the Russians should reach Berlin and should do work of destruction in that city in any respect resembling the work done by the unknown commander in Louvain, The Outlook would condemn such act of reprisal as vigorously as it here condemns the destruction of Louvain, and we believe it would be equally condemned by all civilized peoples throughout the world.

"My great maxim," said Napoleon, "has always been in war, as well as in politics, that every evil action, even if legal, can only be executed in case of absolute necessity; whatsoever goes beyond that is criminal."

We do not believe that any great number of German-American citizens, we shall not believe without conclusive evidence that the majority of Germans in Germany, or that the Kaiser himself, justify what history will call the crime at Louvain.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 021 551 923 5 •